NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment----Without Compromise.

VOLUME V.---NO. 22. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1844. WHOLE NUMBER 230.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.
At 142, Nassau Street, New-York.

Sydney Howard Gay,
Maria Weston Chapman,
Edmund Quincy, } Editors.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to SYDNEY HOWARD GAY.

Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. GAY, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—$2 00 a year, in advance; $2 50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10 00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies, for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1 50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post-Office Department: "A postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

FRIEND GAY:—I have just noticed in the last Standard a letter from Sumner Stebbins, taken from the West Chester Register, and republished at *his* request. Upon the appearance of that letter, I immediately prepared a reply, and sent it to the Register for publication, but it was *refused admittance*; and I therefore send it to thee, for insertion in the Standard—being the more anxious that it should now appear in it, from the fact, that my friend Stebbins has made your columns the channel of a still wider circulation of his views—views which I esteem very essentially erroneous, and therefore cannot feel at liberty to allow them to pass unnoticed. Being denied a hearing through a press of the "more favorable party," I turn to your free columns for redress.

Respectfully, thy friend,

J. FULTON, Jr.

—

From the Liberty Herald.

REPLY TO SUMNER STEBBINS.

ERCILDOUN, 9th mo. 14, 1844.

* * * * * * I was pleased to see a letter from Sumner Stebbins, in the Register of last week, in reply to an article of mine in the Republican. He seems to go at his task with an unmasked, out-spoken, honest zeal, in behalf of Henry Clay, and thus affords me an excellent opportunity of examining his positions, and showing to him, and others similarly affected (if there are any such) their utter fallacy. I go to the task, at least with the hope, that the considerations which I may offer, will have their due weight, and no more. Even this I know can hardly be expected at a period like the present, of almost unexampled political excitement, and partisan fever. But I desire to trust confidently in such as my friend Stebbins, to give our objections to voting with either of the two parties, as calculated to cripple our efforts now and henceforth, the most careful "sober second thought." He thinks it right and expedient to do so—we think it wrong, and that its tendency would be most disastrous to the slave's cause.

He has stated his *five points* very clearly, but by glancing at Clay's letters, all three of which lay before me. I cannot find them stated so clearly there. Where does Clay lay down those five positions—commencing his affirmations with the words,—"It *cannot* be done," &c. Clay commences the summing up of the *probable* difficulties, with the little, significant word,—"if,"—"if,"—"if without the loss of national character," &c.—nowhere declaring that he would resist Annexation even with all these "*ifs*" in the way, but on the contrary, we have every reason to believe that he would use every effort to remove those difficulties, or even set them at naught. If removed, he would view the question "in quite a different light," but if not removed, he does not say that he would oppose; but in his last letter he declares, "I have no *hesitation* in saying, that *far* from having any personal objection to the annexation of Texas, *I should be glad to see it*, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms"—does "not think that the question of Slavery ought to affect the question one way or the other"—does not think its acquisition "will prolong or shorten the duration" of Slavery—does not think it would be wise "to *refuse* a *permanent* acquisition" merely "on account of a temporary institution," (slavery,) and declares, if elected, he "should be governed by the state of facts, and the state of public opinion *existing at the time* I might be called upon to act." He alludes here to the same difficulties mentioned in his Raleigh letter, contained in those five points raised by my friend, but *still* does not affirm that he would resist the measure, though they should *not be* removed—nor that it would be difficult to remove them.

The two first difficulties—"loss of national character" and "hazard of foreign war," vanish upon Mexico giving her consent, and the last, "an unreasonable price for Texas," disappears, when he declares in his last, that he "should be glad to see it," (annexation,) and in the *first* affirms, that if annexed, "the United States will assume, and become responsible for the debt of Texas, *be its amount what it may*."

Three difficulties being disposed of, there remains but two others—"the general concurrence of the Nation," and the "danger to the integrity of the Union."

But first, allow me to allude to the consent of Mexico, as the contingent for the removal of the two first objections. What is it after all, but a contingency which may disappear in a month. Mexico at this moment is preparing to invade Texas, with a strong military force, but she may again meet another San Jacinto defeat. Foreign powers are, and have been, striving to adjust the difficulty between them. Discouraged with repeated attempts and a drained Treasury, she may be induced to acknowledge Texan Independence—or Texas at the suggestion and connivance of the Slave Power of this country, may propose to treat with Mexico, by a proposition to abolish Slavery (that being one of the original causes of difficulties) with a view of its re-establishment, by annexation to the United States, and thus by false pretences expect a reconcilement,—or we have claims against Mexico of long standing; we may press those claims in an arrogant manner purposely to provoke retaliation, and finally, *our Government*, another name merely for the Slave Power, would affect with much profession of regret and solemn gravity, the necessity of redressing ourselves by invading Mexico, probably, and seizing upon Texas. None of these are at all strained suppositions, but in strict agreement with our first treatment of Mexico and various Indian tribes. But further, Clay shows in his first letter, that he only seeks a *plausible occasion* to lay his hands upon the territory, and beautifully exhibits his cloven footed preparations. *War, war*, is one of the serious difficulties in the way, but still "if any European nation," should entertain an idea of getting a foothold in Texas, by "colonizing her," (wonder if he thinks Africa has just cause of war against his colonization saints?) he "should regard it as the imperative duty of the Government of the United States to oppose to *such* designs the most firm and determined resistance, *to the extent, if necessary, of appealing to arms*, to prevent the accomplishment of any such designs." What these designs might be, we are left to infer when he says that Britain has "solemnly disavowed" any "intention to interfere in her *domestic institutions*." So then it is the "*domestic institutions*" of Texas, we are to defend from European interference, whether manifested by way of friendly counsel to seek the abolition of Slavery,—or by "colonizing her" (as the United States *did*, but with a different class) with free negroes from her West India possessions, or with white subjects full of the principles of abolition; and in either case dangerously affect the "domestic institutions" of Texas; and consequently affect perniciously similar institutions in the United States There is nothing strange in all this, for it is the studied course of the Slave Power in similar cases, and when too it had a *similar agent*. In May 1826, Clay, as Secretary of State, instructed our Ministers, Anderson and Sergeant, appointed to represent our Government in the Congress of *Panama*, to resist the intention of the new Republics of Colombia and Mexico of invading Cuba, and the *attendant* consequences of the abolition of Slavery in that island by the emancipating armies of those Republics on the ground of "the *contagion* of such near and dangerous examples" to our slave population; and the instructions threatened in case of further persistance in the measure of such invasion, "to employ *all* the means necessary" to prevent it. Our ministers at the Courts of St. Petersburgh and Madrid were likewise instructed by Clay—the first to press the Prussian Government to interpose its friendly offices with the King of Spain, to induce him to make peace with his refractory colonies, and the latter to the same end, that the abolition of Slavery might be prevented in Cuba. He opposed the admission of Texas on the ground that it would involve us in war, when he declares his readiness to go to war to prevent her "domestic institutions" from being assailed, even by "colonizing her?" Ludicrous enough! The Slave Power too, with such a friend, as its head and leader, would soon discover with its Argus eyes, some *suspicious* intentions on the part of Great Britain fully sufficient to justify the little trifle of disregarding Mexico, even if she should remain inexorable herself, and annexing Texas without further delay; and Texas herself, would help in every form to foment such suspicions and jealousies. Have I not often offered contingencies sufficient, any one of which would do a slaveholding Government and President, as an occasion for consummating the deed, and *then*, it will be no worse than we have already acted out towards Mexico in other matters.

But it cannot be effected, "with the general concurrence of the nation." What does he mean by general concurrence? My friend thinks that Clay would not favor the plan, although the "opposition spring from Anti-Slavery feeling." So thought some of the Alabama people, at least that his letter implied that; but Clay assures them in his Tuscaloosa letter, that "as to the idea of my courting the Abolitionists, it is perfectly *absurd*. No man in the United States has been half so much abused by them as I have been." Encouraging this, and very dignified, to be anxious about such a man's promotion? How is he to understand whether there is a general concurrence?—other than through the representatives of the people. True, State Legislatures have protested against the measure, but *more* have declared in favor of it. Finally, after much discussion of the subject, a bill comes up, is voted for by the Democrats and Southern Whigs, and carried. Might not, *and would not* Clay consider such a vote, after the whole country had canvassed the matter, to use the concluding words of his letter—as a "general expression of public opinion" in its favor? And would he not then give his sanction to the measure?—when too, he could do so, and if necessary stave off some of the odium to appease Northern feeling, by saddling the responsibility upon the Democratic party, and pleading his conscientious scruples about the use of the veto power; "and that therefore, however *unpleasant the duty*, he felt bound to carry out the wishes of the people." But my friend says "there are *plenty* of Polk men at the North, who are at heart opposed to it," and perhaps he will say that there will of course be a few of them in Congress, and therefore there will not be sufficient unanimity to pass the bill. Granted, and I believe it. Then I say there is no need of his sacrificing his influence with Democrats—with his Anti-Slavery friends, and gain none additionally with the Whigs, by voting for Clay to keep out Texas, when it cannot take place under either, while Congress stands opposed to the measure.

And my friend Stebbins knows well, that there is a mighty movement now being made in New-York State among the Democrats, headed by the noble and gifted Bryant and Sedgwick, to elect members to Congress opposed to Annexation; and I cannot but look upon all efforts to make out the Democratic party as pledged to the measure as most suicidal; when at the same time it is tried to be made to appear that the Whigs will oppose it, because every such effort has a tendency to make the Democrats what, as yet, they are not; and to make the Whigs feel that they have cajoled us out of our principles—and being secure of our vote, they feel that it is unnecessary to do more, *for the vote is their aim*.

But it cannot be done "*without any danger to the integrity of the Union*." This objection, from such a source, is not deserving of a moment's consideration, if it can be called an objection, for he still does not affirm that it would have such an effect, but "*if*" it should have that *tendency* it would be of doubtful propriety. And his own reasoning, as quoted by my friend, Clay flings aside himself in his last letter. *There*, we can find nothing about the *danger* of still "further acquisitions," but that he "should be glad to see it," and that it would be "unwise to *refuse* a permanent acquisition," "on account of a temporary institution." Yes, the little matter of an "institution" which chattelizes three millions of souls, and is seeking further extension, is entirely too trifling to compare in importance with the acquisition of some millions of acres *of land*, because the former is merely a *temporary* thing.

How short-lived it is in the mind of Henry Clay, we may learn by a recurrence to his atrocious speech of '39. "It is frequently asked, what is to become of the African race among us? Are they forever to remain in bondage? That question was asked more than half a century ago. It has been answered by fifty years of prosperity, but little chequered from this cause. *It will be repeated fifty or a hundred years hence.*" This, then, is what he holds to be "temporary." Oh! what a cold, hardened, *villainous* sentiment. I feel that if I were one of the victims of this "temporary" affair, no language would be adequate to express my loathing horror of such a being; and I cannot permit myself to doubt but my friend would feel similarly. Happily, such is not our lot—shall we help to make it the lot of others?

In what way will it endanger the Union? Not a few in the South are threatening dissolution *unless it is annexed*, and who doubts but if the contest was to wax warm, that to preserve the "integrity of the Union," he would make some "compromise" and annex Texas. Why not? For certainly a little threatening on the part of the North will have no effect—*we* are only farmers, while *they* are "our Southern brethren." And further, in the "Missouri struggle," did he fear Northern threats? By no means; but counselled to the letter, and the line, with the Slave Power, and he boasted last spring in a speech delivered in Milledgeville, the capital of Georgia, of the leading part he took in that controversy, and I have a late letter of his before me, to the Missouri Whigs, reminding them of the services he had rendered that State, but that he asked nothing in return; he had "merely performed his *duty!*" A *duty* to aid in extending and perpetuating Slavery *then*—and *now* the question of bondage "should not *affect* the question one way or the other." Clay, then, was the man who pushed Missouri into the Union regardless of the North—"compromised" again with the South in 1833, to preserve the "integrity of the Union," and the North again had to yield; and does the man live who can suppose that, in case the South became clamorous for Annexation, as they are already in South Carolina, that Clay would hold out against it? He has not even professed such a thing, but on the contrary, he declared in his last letter that he will be governed by "the state of public opinion existing at the time." What is "public opinion" with this Government? My friend knows well that it is the imperative command of *Slavery*.

He also shows in the cause of temperance, that if he represents any one man's example more pernicious than another, it is the *respectable* tippler, or moderate drinker, and not the wallowing drunkard, and for the simple reason that the former would have a much greater influence to evil,—so of Clay, his position is the most dangerous. Polk comes out, and if elected, and should consummate the dark deed irrespective of all the difficulties stated, it will serve to rouse the entire people, as with an earthquake shock, and the terrible re-action would startle this nation from its drunken dream, to produce mighty results for the cause of universal liberty. But let Clay, with his smooth cunning, his skillful diplomacy, his deferential airs *professedly* toward the North, go to work with his suavity upon our Northern members of Congress (as he declared in his Georgia speech that he operated privately upon members, pending the Missouri question, *and won their pledges* in support of the measure,) and not only upon members of Congress, but every department of Government, the effect would be, that the measure might finally be carried, and the people's fears and alarms being measurably allayed, they would acquiesce, with but a feeble shade of opposition, and Slavery might then run a free course, and be glorified.

I have done with my friend's five points, and I appeal to him, and all others, if the thoughts offered in review, are not of the first importance, and if they are not deserving of being controlling in their character?

But again, "Will Friend Fulton meet the question, whether there *is as much* reason to believe that Texas will be admitted under Clay as under Polk.?" Most gladly will I reply, whether I meet the "question" in my friend's estimation or not, but hope I shall. And I will go further, and affirm that to vote *for either*, is to vote for "*immediate* Annexation."

I have an argument in point prepared to my hand which I will give, and better to my own mind, than I could do it myself. It is from the pen of Dr. Bailey, the talented editor of the "Cincinnati Herald." I had expressed some views already in this week's "Republican" upon this point, but not near so fully as this goes into the question, and I shall therefore be excused in giving it all.

My friend will pardon the allusion to himself, called forth by the strange account the Whigs of the West are making of his name and letter:

"We have already clearly shown that the question of Texas will be decided, neither by the election of Mr. Clay, nor that of Mr. Polk. Great as is the power of a President, his action on the subject is nothing, unless he is seconded by a *concurring* Congress. But, each party is divided in its policy in relation to Annexation, so that the party representation in Congress will in the same manner be divided, thus prevening any immediate, conclusive action. With a majority of Whigs, we shall have just as much to fear, as with a majority of Democrats. For it is a matter of record, that the Democrats, as a *minority* in the House of Representatives, have always taken more obnoxious ground in favor of the slaveholding interest, that when in the *majority*. During the last session of Congress, although vastly the dominant party, they kept the questions of the tariff and the gag both open, the latter for near three months, the former throughout the whole session, and at last passed the gag with a manifest reluctance by a diminished democratic vote, while they refused to change the tariff. Such is their action, when the responsibility of a majority rests upon them. We should therefore apprehend more from them as a minority in the next Congress, than as a majority.

Recollect—no one expects any policy will be adopted by the *present Congress* in relation to Texas, other than what it has already passed. The speculation is all about the next Congress. But there yet remains an interval of a year and a half, during which *two* elections will take place. What changes may not happen in that time? Judging from the past two years, what changes will take place? It is notorious that it was the increase of the Liberty vote that made the Democratic delegation in Congress, from the Eastern States, falter when called upon to re-adopt the gag; and they took two months to determine the question, whether they would not lose as much in the North, as they would gain in the South, by this detestable policy.

Bear these remarks in mind, while we take this position;—that a large Liberty vote, even though it should occasion the defeat of the Whig party, which is an unauthorized supposition, will not only *not* favor the Annexation of Texas, but will be the *only* safeguard against it. Let us have the attention of that class of Anti-Slavery men, who think it best *this once* to support Henry Clay to prevent Annexation.

In the first place, your policy is uncalled for. Though the Democrats should succeed, they are so divided on the propriety of *immediate* Annexation, as we have lately proved to you, that that event could not be apprehended if the Liberty vote should show a fair increase of the active Anti-Slavery sentiment of the nation. And if by your vote you place the Whigs in power, you have succeeded only in preventing *immediate* Annexation. The whole question is still an open one, and so far as the declaration of leading Whigs in the South, leading papers, and large Conventions can give us light, a question which they expect to be decided at last in favor of Slavery.

So that your policy, while uncalled for by any pressing exigency will not have settled the question at all.

But in the second place, your vote *will be in favor of immediate Annexation*. This will startle you. When men disregard the dictates of right principle, and begin to take counsel of mere expediency, they will be seen to run into error, from looking only at that side of the question which is accommodated to their prejudices. *No* man whose prejudices were not in *favor of Henry Clay* on other grounds, would ever think of supporting him for the sake of accomplishing Anti-Slavery objects, or defeating Texas Annexation.

Now attend:—suppose your example should be generally followed, the result would be, a standing still, or falling off in the Liberty vote. Your vote being absorbed in the Whig party, would *tell nothing definitely*. They would only go to utter this party sentiment, that Annexation under *present* circumstances is inexpedient—and that it is inexpedient, not because it would extend or perpetuate Slavery, but because it would involve war with Mexico, the assumption of a heavy debt, &c. That is all,—that would be the voice of your ballot. What would be the result? If, after all, the Democrats should succeed, their present division of sentiment would be sealed. Despising what they would consider the treachery of Anti-Slavery men to their principles, and unrestrained by any apprehension of danger from the Liberty vote, *then diminished*, they would have no motive to resist the urgency of the South, which, united on the question, by their aid, would accomplish the much desired Annexation. But if they should be defeated, what then? A Whig majority from the free States would not be able to maintain the ground against a *combination* of the whole South, Whig and Democratic, with the Democratic minority from the North. And, it is almost certain, that such minority, the Liberty vote being *diminished*, and therefore no longer to be *feared* or courted, would seek strength among the slaveholders, by *any* amount of sacrifice. Thus, in *either* case, Annexation would most probably be effected! And this too, by your vote, by the miserable policy of weakening or breaking up an organization, founded on distinctive Anti-Slavery principles, and which, if it should stand fast, and grow in power, must necessarily have the effect of preventing Northern politicians of all classes from courting slaveholding support.

In 1840, we gave 7,000 votes for Liberty; in 1843, nearly 60,000. Would you know the evidence of the power of these 60,000 votes? What meant the two or three months delay, of the Democrats last session of Congress in re-enacting the gag? What meant the impassioned appeals of the Whig press to Anti-Slavery men, pleading for votes, which in 1840 they were almost ashamed to accept, openly? Why their glorification of such men as Burchard, Stebbins, and Mecaskey, and others, recreants to their principles, slaves of a miserable expediency? And why the subdued tone among the Democrats? How happens it, that so far from raising the mad-dog cry of Abolitionists against the Whigs, they are assiduous in showing why they should have no claim to the name? Think you that the change of sentiment indicated by these things, would have taken place, if freemen had not begun to concentrate their Anti-Slavery strength at the ballot-box? And would you break apart an organization, which in its infancy has rendered itself so formidable. Dissolve it—weaken it.—and where is the hope of freedom? What restraining power at the North would then counteract the sinister influence of the Slave Power of the South? Maintain it and strengthen it; and then tell us, if sixty thousand votes have done so much for Liberty, what will one hundred thousand, or one hundred and fifty thousand, the number we anticipate? That number would seal the Texas question, and settle another still more important question, of which the *former* is but an incident—the question of slaveholding domination.

Let every man, then, who would save his country from the Annexation of Texas, and slaveholding supremacy, vote the Liberty ticket. He who does otherwise, substantially gives his support to Slavery and Texas."

I cannot but indulge a confidential hope that this view of the subject, so luminously stated—so thoroughly fortified at every point, by the editor of the Herald, must and will have an influence upon my friend, favorable to a *re*-consideration of his views as expressed in the article under review.

One more fact, and I must close. Throughout this letter, one object has been to show that neither party is to be trusted—that both were ruled by the Slave Power; and here I will close by offering some additional testimony to this end, as an offset to my friend's allusion to the "cringing subserviency" of the Democrats. It was universally understood that the Northern Whigs would yield to the Slave Power, the candidate for the Presidency; but they claimed the Vice Presidency as a matter of course; and that Sergeant, Davis, Fillmore, and McKean were their men. But the Slave Power remembered that Sergeant had voted in the "Reform Convention" of this State, in favor of universal suffrage, irrespective of color—that Ex-Governor Davis had signed the abolition resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature—that Fillmore was too active in defence of the right of petition, and that Judge McLean had made some decisions too favorable to freedom,—and therefore they would not do. Ever on the look-out, that power decided on their course without loss of time,—and *Horace Greely*, the able editor of the "New-York Tribune," writing from Baltimore, tells what that course was. "The matter was substantially settled in a meeting of the Southern members last evening." Yes! they held a caucus immediately, and settled it, that these four distinguished men should be laid aside, and another one, entirely unthought of, should be pressed upon the Convention, and the result was that he got all the Southern members, those from New Jersey, and *one* from New-York. Like in the Democratic Convention, these men stood by Frelinghuysen until the North had to yield. They knew their man—they remembered his violent speeches against us in 1834 and 1835—they had not forgotten his writings in extenuation of Slavery. He was as much dragged forth, an unknown man, as was J. K. Polk. But to be right certain, a Dr. Gall, of Hernando, Mississippi, puts the question to him, and he replies, "That he *is not* an Abolitionists *and never has been*." This, the Louisville Journal says, will "*silence* the clamorous" of those who would "TRADUCE" (!!) a "great and *good* man!" The National Intelligencer is also proving him sound, by republishing his pro-slavery views from the "Literary and Theological Review of 1834," about the time he was stimulating mobs to deeds of arson, perpetrated on the property of Dr. Cox and Lewis Tappan, by his violent pro-slavery speeches in New-York. Why should *we not* feel anxious to vote for such men as Clay and Frelinghuysen? I must stop. Respectfully, &c.

J. FULTON, Jr.

From the Register and Examiner.

LETTER FROM SUMNER STEBBINS.

[COPIED BY REQUEST.]

KENNET SQUARE, September 24th, 1844.

MR. EDITOR:—I attended a meeting got up by the Liberty party, in your borough yesterday, and listened with much interest, and no little delight to the speeches of Elder, Aaron, and Fulton. They failed, however, to convince me that I ought to abandon all effectual, practical, efficient and adequate action upon that great and paramount measure of the Anti-Slavery enterprise, (the annexation of Texas,) because, in order to prevent its consummation, I am absolutely compelled to choose an agent who is a slaveholder. On this all important point, in particular, their arguments—if they deserve that name—were weak, puerile, and abortive. Mr. Elder, whose address in the main was an intellectual treat, and one of the finest specimens of stump oratory that I ever listened to, "relied altogether on the *imbecility* of James K. Polk, in case he should be elected, as his *only ground of hope* that Annexation would not take place. As Mr. Polk had declared for immediate Annexation, regardless of the claims of Mexico, he could not, any more than John Tyler, acknowledge her right to be consulted in the matter, and he could enter into no negotiation with that Government, nor would Mexico, knowing his position, condescend to treat with him on the subject. He therefore would have no other course left him but to seize on Texas with robber hands, which act would be but the commencement of a bloody war with Mexico, and probably with England. This was the policy to which Polk had committed himself, and it was the only one which he could attempt to carry out, and in this he *might* be defeated by the combined opposition of the Whig party, and a portion of the Northern Democrats. He would therefore trust to Polk's weakness rather than to Clay's cunning. For Mr. Clay, on the contrary, he contended, would stand in a very different relation toward Mexico, he having always treated her with respect, and admitted her right to Texas until she voluntarily relinquished it: therefore Mexico could, without any humiliation of her national pride, transfer by treaty to Clay what she would scorn to be bullied out of by Polk. Under these circumstances, he believed that Clay would be able to accomplish by diplomacy that which Polk would be unable to effect by force."

This, as near as I can remember, was the substance of his remarks on this head. Now for a brief examination of them:

In the first place, I agree with Mr. Elder that Polk and his supporters are fully committed to a war policy, and that he cannot consistently pursue any other. But to rely on his want of power to carry out his measures in case he is elected, strikes me as not only the height of danger to the country, but as the extreme of human folly. If the party opposed to him are not strong enough to defeat his election, how in the name of common sense are they to arrest his fatal course, after he is elected? Will not those who make him President give him a majority in Congress, and will they not regard his election as the judgment of the nation in favor of their reckless course? Let them obtain the power, and what reason have we to suppose that they will forbear—and what possible chance will there be to keep them in check, when the day for successful opposition has gone by? Look at their conduct last winter. Was not the Locofoco majority in the Lower House, willing to aid John Tyler and his vile clan, in their efforts to involve the country in a war with Mexico, and such other Power as might take her part? *Can any man on earth deny that we should at this moment be in the midst of a hot war for the acquisition of slave territory, but for the noble and firm stand taken by a Whig Senate?* While Tyler's infamous Treaty was before that body, were not measures put in train by the Government, for an immediate engagement with the land and naval forces of Mexico, in case that Power should make a hostile movement towards Texas? And in the teeth of all this, was not that Treaty supported by fifteen out of twenty-two Locofoco Senators, at a time too before the party was publicly committed to the measure? If such things are done in the green, what may we look for in the dry? Did not both the Pennsylvania Senators, with others from the free States, to their everlasting shame, vote for it? And can any man show in the proceedings of any Locofoco meeting, or in the columns of any press of the party, the first word condemnatory of that perfidious and war provoking act? More than all, and above all, did not a National Convention reject Mr. Van Buren, because he objected to going into what he regarded as an unjust war? Did they not, by this act, signify to the world, that they were for immediate Annexation, regardless of the faith of Treaties; or the guilt and barbarity of ruthless aggression upon a sister Republic? A majority of the delegates composing that body, were under instructions to support Martin Van Buren, and why was he not nominated? Was it because he was opposed to the admission of Texas under all circumstances? No—nothing of the kind. His letter on the subject shows that he was warmly and strongly in favor of it, as soon as it could be accomplished without a disgraceful war with Mexico, and with any show of decency. But farther than that he was unwilling to go. And because he was not ready instantly to commence the foul work of pillage and slaughter; because he was unwilling to put himself at the head of a marauding, plundering horde, who were bent on the immediate perpetration of the blackest felony recorded in human history, he was politically massacred, and a tool fit for such a deed, one who was much less troubled with conscientious scruples about "national honor," "unjust war," &c. was selected for that particular purpose, and with especial regard to that very object.

The Washington Spectator, a Polk paper, under the influence of John C. Calhoun, in speaking of the nomination, holds the following language: "*Never was there a more remarkable proof of the power of the South, when united, than in controlling the nomination of that Convention.* The man (Mr. Van Buren) in whose favor she had declared—in whose favor the whole North and West had declared—came out against (the immediate annexation of Texas) a policy essential to her peace and safety. She made one brave rally and swept all opposition before her. And so it will ever be. *Texas defeated Van Buren, and it will destroy Clay and Benton.*" Such is the lordly manner in which the Southern Slaveholder cracks his whip over the heads of the Northern Democrats, (*Democrats, indeed!*) after having brought them to the most abject and criminal submission. While reading this cruel boast of the Spectator, it should be borne in mind that Benton has always been a staunch friend of Annexation, and holds himself ready to adopt such measures as are necessary to effect it, whenever it can be done, to use his own words, "without the crime and infamy of unjust war." But the man who scruples about such trifling matters as "national crime and infamy," or the butchery of a few thousand Mexicans, or the stealing of two hundred millions of acres of land, is not the man to receive the confidence and support of the Annexation party of the South. An instant's pause, a single shudder on the brink of the black gulf of infamy and war—a moment's hesitation in dread of crime so enormous and gigantic—the slightest tremor, or anxious seeking for delay, as in the case of Van Buren, and political martyrdom awaits him. Let this fact then ever be kept in view, that the man in whose favor "the South and the whole North and West had declared," was sacrificed, not because he was opposed to the ultimate and peaceful admission of Texas, but for no other reason than because he was not in favor of *immediate* Annexation, regardless of treaties, foreign war, or any calamity, however dire, that might be the certain and inevitable result. And upon the same reckless and diabolical principle is James K. Polk supported at the present moment.

The Spectator is sustained in its insolent though truthful assertion, by no less a personage than Gen. Jackson himself. In his letter of June 14th, 1844, he says, "Had Mr. Van Buren come out for *immediate* Annexation, *he would have received the unanimous vote of the Convention, as a candidate for the Presidency, and would have been elected by the South and West by acclamation.*" Here, then, are the true grounds on which Van Buren and Polk stood before the Convention, on the first discovery of the latter gentleman by that body, after it had balloted no less than seven times for a candidate. "Polk would never have been thought of but for Texas, and will never be remembered except in connection with Texas." Both he and Van Buren were in favor of Annexation, but Polk alone was for *immediate* Annexation, and that with them made a world of difference.

It is now said that Henry Clay shows "a Southern face," because he has no personal objection to the annexation of Texas, and would be glad to see it, *without dishonor, without war, with the common consent* of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." Van Buren too showed "a Southern face," a far better and more smiling one than Clay, without more than half as many, or as huge objections, and the South, pledged as it was in his favor, spit upon his Southern face, and trampled him under their feet. There are some who have the hardihood to *pretend* that they can see little or no difference between the present position of Clay, in regard to Annexation, and that of James K. Polk. The difference between Van Buren's position and that of Polk's was far less discernible, and yet *it was seen most distinctly by every Southern eye* in that Convention which spurned the former, and honored the latter with a nomination. It decided the tumultuous proceedings of that body, and may decide the destinies of this republic for all time to come. J. Fulton, jr. in the course of his remarks yesterday, was inconsiderate enough to attempt to make out that Van Buren took as strong ground against Annexation as Henry Clay. On this point he and the Washington Globe are at issue, and after quoting a passage from that paper which appeared soon after the publication of Mr. Van Buren's letter, I will leave him and Blair to settle the matter to their mutual satisfaction. "The country, (said the Globe, before Van Buren was guillotined,) will have to choose between the proposition of Mr. Van Buren, which enables a bare majority of the Congress of the United States to open wide the doors of the Union, inviting Texas into its family of States, or that of Messrs. Tyler and Calhoun, which enables one-third of the Senate to shut the door in her face; and also that of Mr. Clay, which bars it forever against her admission. We ardently desire to see Texas admitted, and we embrace the plan of Mr. Van Buren as the most practicable to accomplish it." Let J. Fulton say what he will, it cannot be shown that Clay is as favorable to Annexation as Van Buren or Benton, and yet says the authority above quoted, "Texas defeated Van Buren, and will yet destroy Clay and Benton." Even Benton, the early and constant advocate of what he calls "the re-union of what originally constituted Texas, to the United States," the moment he boggles about the "faith of treaties," "unjust war," &c. is doomed to "destruction," by the same influence which "controlled the Convention" that nominated Polk. The Annexation party of the South go for the *immediate* accomplishment of their fell purpose, and regard its postponement, for any consideration whatever, as identical with defeat. "Now or never" was the cry—"postponement is death to our hopes." "*Now is the golden moment*," say they, and all who are not for *immediate* Annexation are looked upon by them as its enemies. In my humble opinion, they are exactly right in this view of the subject. Unless Texas is seized upon immediately, and maintained by such carnage and bloody havoc as shall overwhelm and subdue the spirit of Mexico, and whatever allies a sympathy for a wronged and despoiled people may bring to her assistance, the execrable deed can never be accomplished. The South knows this perfectly well, and is ready to run the hazard. Calhoun, Tyler, Wise, Holmes, and all the rest of that kidney, admit the probability, and they know the certainty of war as a consequence of Annexation. No intelligent person, North or South, expects that the United States can take Texas to herself, without a sanguinary struggle with that power which has a legal and rightful claim to it. In this opinion Clay, Van Buren, Benton, Wright, and in fact every enlightened man of both parties agree. The South sees that unless we fight for it, we can never get it, and therefore, they, with much propriety, rank as enemies of the project, all who are not ready and willing to plunge the country into a war, in which the sympathies of all christendom would be against us—a contest in which, to use the language of Jefferson, "the Almighty has no attribute which would enable him to take sides with us." Such, then, is the position of the two great parties at the present time.

Clay, in his last letter on this subject, says, "I cannot but regard the annexation of Texas, at this time, as compromitting the honor of my country, involving it in a war, endangering the integrity of the Union;" and he adds, "national dishonor, foreign war, and distraction and division at home, are too great sacrifices to make for the acquisition of Texas." Polk, on the other hand, says, "I have no hesitation in declaring that I am for the immediate annexation of Texas to the territory of the United States. The wide difference of the two candidates, and that of their respective supporters, in their relation to this issue, may be seen at a glance. They are as far apart as the north is from the south pole—or as national honor is from national disgrace—a aggressive, plundering war, is from a state of virtuous peace—as cold-blooded, unprovoked murder and robbery, is from a sacred regard for human life and the rights of person and property—or as States divided, discordant, belligerent, and rent with civil feuds, is from a paternal, happy and prosperous Union—or, in short, as light is from darkness—as heaven is from hell.

Thus far, I have not alluded to the object for which the South wish to acquire Texas. But there is no difficulty on this head. Slavery, human chattelism, its perpetuity and extension, is the only object. This, though denied by some dolts at the North, is unblushingly avowed by the leading men and presses at the South, who favor the iniquitous scheme. I might, were it necessary, quote scores of pages to prove it. But we are told that Mr. Clay entertains a different opinion as to its ultimate effect. He looks upon slavery as a "temporary institution, destined to become extinct at some distant day by the operation of the inevitable laws of population;" and thinks that "the subject of slavery ought not to affect the question of Annexation one way or the other." From this frank disclosure of his sentiments, it is clear that he could not be depended upon to keep Texas out of the Union, in case all his other objections could be removed. But that I hold to be impossible, and therefore I have no fears on that score. It will be impossible, under any circumstances, that I can conceive of, to annex Texas "*without dishonor*"—it will be impossible to take it "*without war*"—and it will certainly be forever impossible to admit it "*with the common consent of the Union.*" Mr. Clay may think that "the subject of slavery ought not to affect the question one way or other," but I think very differently, and if I could believe it probable that *his* objections could be removed, I certainly would not vote for him. Whatever may be the means of the final abolition of slavery, Mr. Clay himself will not deny that the Annexation of Texas will extend the relation of the free States to Slavery—that we shall at once become the partners of the owners of twenty-six thousand more slaves—and that we shall be liable to be called on to march a thousand or fifteen hundred miles into the interior of Texas to crush a slave insurrection. And whether it will "prolong or shorten the duration of that institution," it cannot be denied that the extension and perpetuation of slavery was the *leading motive* of those who hatched the late treaty, and that such is the present design and intent of nearly all who go for "Polk and Texas."

The history of the origin of this stratagem is thus clearly and briefly stated by the Hon. Joshua R. Giddings: "Mr. Upshur, then acting as Secretary of State, received from some person (supposed to be Duff Green) then in London, information that an effort was making by the philanthropists of Great Britain to procure the abolition of Slavery in Texas. Information of a discussion in the British House of Lords was also communicated. In that discussion it seems that Lord Brougham had alluded to the fact that the abolition of Slavery in Texas would have the effect to hasten its abolition in the United States, as it would destroy the market now furnished by the people of Texas to the slave-breeding States of this Union. This announcement appears to have alarmed Mr. Upshur, who had early turned his attention to Texas as a market for the slave population of the United States. His alarm also appears to have been increased by the announcement from gentlemen of high consideration in Texas, that that Government would probably '*abolish Slavery within the next five years, unless it should be annexed to the United States.*' Such an event would place the line between Slavery and Liberty upon the southern border of our slave States, and would confine the institution of domestic slavery upon the North American continent to the slaveholding States of this Union. If it be thus restricted, with our free States on the north, and the voice of the civilized world, and the influence of christendom against it, no doubt remains that its speedy destruction must be inevitable. It was in view of these circumstances that southern statesmen declared that the Annexation of Texas is '*a question of the most vital interest to the slaveholding States.*' They say that 'SLAVERY MUST CONTINUE IN TEXAS, OR CEASE IN THE UNITED STATES.' They were therefore driven to assume the doctrine now contended for by Southern Democrats, and assented to by the Northern portion of that party, that '*the federal Government is bound to uphold and protect the Slavery of the Southern States.*' This novel theory was asserted by Mr. Upshur, and re-affirmed by his successor, J. C. Calhoun, the present Secretary of State. It was repeated by Senators and Representatives in Congress, by Southern primary meetings of the Democratic party, and the Southern Democratic press generally. It caused the rejection of Mr. Van Buren, and the nomination of Mr. Polk, and is now the leading policy of the Southern wing of the Democratic party, and is tacitly assented to by the supporters of Mr. Polk in the free States. Indeed, I am not aware that any statesman, and not more than two public papers, of the whole Democratic party of the free States, possess the independence publicly to deny their obligation to support the Slavery of the South."

Here, then, is the great and principal issue between the two parties. The Democrats aver that we are under Constitutional obligations to support the institution of domestic Slavery in our Southern States. That its pecuniary burden, its moral turpitude, and its public odium, shall rest upon the people of our free States as well as on those of the slave States; and that we are bound to furnish a market for the slave-breeding States, where "men, women, and children, may be sold like oxen in the shambles." Such are the principles and objects of those who have succeeded in putting down Van Buren, and in putting up Polk. His election will be regarded as the verdict of the nation in favor of the immediate Annexation of Texas, which is tantamount to an immediate declaration of war upon Mexico. Under these circumstances, it is my candid opinion, that every citizen of the United States, who votes for Polk, votes for war with our sister republic with all its horrors, and votes to extend and perpetuate domestic servitude, with all its guilt and cruelties. He votes for shooting and stabbing the innocent people of Mexico, who have shown a disposition for nothing but peace and friendship with us—he votes for enlarging the empire of human bondage, and for aggravating the unutterable woes

willingness to ACCEPT the nomination. Of this fact there is not the least possible doubt. Great efforts have since been made, and are making, to conceal the evidence—especially of Mr. Birney's acquiescence in the nomination, and his adhesion to "Democratic principles," and the Polk and Dallas party; but these facts can no longer be denied. We are enabled to submit evidence of a character to convince every candid mind. We leave the public to judge. Subjoined is the sworn statement of Wm. S. Driggs, Esq. a gentleman of intelligence, and perfectly unimpeachable moral character. We vouch for his unsullied honor and veracity.

J. M. HOWARD,
F. A. HARDING,
S. BARSTOW,
D. SMART,
JOHN OWEN,
} Committee.

Detroit, October 14, 1844.

State of Michigan, Wayne County, ss:

William S. Driggs, of Detroit, in said State, being duly sworn, says, on Wednesday, the 9th day of October, instant, he left the city of Detroit for the purpose of going to Saginaw, in this State, and ascertaining the facts and circumstances relative to the nomination of James G. Birney, Esq. to the Legislature of this State, by the "Democratic" party, in the county of Saginaw: that on the 12th day of October, instant, he called at the dwelling of J. B. Garland, Esq. about nine miles from Saginaw city, and had a conversation of considerable length with him: that said Garland informed deponent, that he, said Garland, was a member of the "Democratic" party: that he was a member of the Democratic Convention of said county, held at Saginaw city on the 28th day of September last, for the purpose of nominating candidates for county officers, and for representative in the Legislature of this State: that he, said Garland, attended said Convention, (which was held at the house of E. Jewett:) that James G. Birney, Esq. (who resides at Lower Saginaw, in said Saginaw county,) was then and there nominated by said Convention, as the candidate of the Democratic party for such representative by a unanimous vote: that he, said Garland, had had several conversations with said Birney some days previous to the meeting of said Convention, in reference to said Birney's willingness to accept such nomination, remarking, that he should be quite willing to accept it if tendered to him, and would, if elected, serve the county to the best of his abilities, and refrain from agitating the question of Abolition in the House; that he, said Birney, was a Jeffersonian Democrat, and always had been: said Garland also stated to this deponent, that, when in the said Convention he was questioned by other members respecting Mr. Birney's political sentiments and opinions, and that, in answer, he stated to the Convention what he then stated to this deponent. Deponent then asked him what *other* authority he had for making said statement to the Convention?—to which he replied, that he had in his possession a letter from Mr. Birney himself, authorizing him to make such statement. Deponent then requested him to show him the letter: said Garland declined, remarking that he would show it to no one unless said Birney should deny having authorized him to make such statement, in which case he would produce it. Said Garland is a man of respectability and good standing, and a "Democrat" of influence in said county. He expressed his determination to vote for Birney, and to do all in his power to promote his election, affirming that he (Birney) was the regularly nominated candidate of the party, and that those of the Democrats who had declared against him constituted but a mere faction. He also stated that he was well acquainted with Mr. Birney, and that the latter was in the habit of frequently stopping at his house. Deponent then requested said Garland to make an affidavit of the facts he had thus stated; but he refused, alledging that he had been informed that Mr. Birney's nomination was producing some excitement abroad, and, perhaps, injuring the Democratic party, and he was unwilling to do anything which might have that effect.

Deponent further says, that on the day before, he had a conversation with Mr. E. Jewett, the keeper of the house at which said Convention was held, and was informed by him that he heard said Garland state in said Convention, in a public manner, that Mr. Birney had professed to him to be a Democrat and promised, if elected, to carry out "Democratic principles." Said Jewett refused to give deponent a written statement of this fact, for the same reason given by Mr. Garland for his refusal; but the fact that said Garland did make such a declaration in the Convention, is to the knowledge of this deponent generally stated and believed by the residents of the village, where the Convention was held, and that in conversation, with numerous persons there, of all political parties, he heard no one deny the fact.

Deponent further says that a *written statement* of said Garland's declaration in the Convention, was some days after it was held, and after Mr. Birney had left Saginaw for the East, drawn up by another delegate of the same Convention, and submitted to Mr. Garland, and corrected and approved by him, in which the following passage occurs:

"Mr. Birney had declared to him (Garland) his willingness to receive the nomination for representative at the hands of the Democratic party." But the gentleman who drew it up, and now has it in his possession, refuses to permit the same to be published.

Deponent further says that he called on Mr. Jenny, the Editor of the North Star, a "Democratic" newspaper, printed at Saginaw city, in which the proceedings of said Convention were published, and was shown by him the original manuscript containing the said proceedings, and that the following is a true copy thereof, as published in said newspaper of the 3d of October instant:

DEMOCRATIC COUNTY CONVENTION.

The Democratic Delegates from the several townships in the county of Saginaw, met in Convention, pursuant to notice previously given, at the house of E. Jewett, in Saginaw city, on Saturday, the 28th day of September, Albert Miller, Esq. was called to the Chair, and Truman M. Waters, appointed Secretary.

The object of the Convention was stated to be, to nominate suitable persons, to be supported at the ensuing election for county officers.

The following delegates appeared and took their seats:

SAGINAW.—E. M. Davenport, Joshua Blackmore, Albert Miller, Anthony R. Swartout, James A. Kent.

TAYMOUTH.—A. F. Hayden, J. Malone, J. B. Garland, Jas. Farquahson, John Farquahson.

TUSCOLA.—T. M. Waters, E. Davis, E. Ellis, H. Davis, A. H. Williams.

TITTABAWASSA.—Thomas McCarty, Wm. Shields, Robert Use, Samuel Shattuck, James Gotee.

HAMPTON.—S. S. Campbell, J. E. Marsac, Benjamin F. Cushway, Sherman Wheeler, Louis Tromly.

The following nominations were made by the Convention:

For Representative—James G. Birney. *For Associate Judges*—Gardner D. Williams, Andrew Ewers. *For Treasurer*—Sidney S. Campbell. *For Sheriff*—Joshua Blackmore. *For County Clerk*—W. L. P. Little. *For Judge of Probate*—Albert Miller. *For Register of Deeds*—Thomas Simson. *For County Surveyor*—James J. McCormick. *For Coroners*—E. N. Davenport and F. Davis.

Resolved, That the above ticket be declared unanimously nominated by this Convention.

A. MILLER, Chairman.

T. M. WATERS, Secretary.

Said editor refused to part with the manuscript, on the ground of a breach of confidence. The fact of Mr. Birney's acquiescence in said nomination, and adhesion to the party nominating him, is of general notoriety in said county, and especially in Saginaw city; and is further proved by the following declaration of G. D. Williams, Thomas McCarty, A. F. Hayden, and N. Beach, all leading Democrats in said county, and two of them (A. F. Hayden and Mr. McCarty,) members of said Convention:

"One of the delegates to the Convention, (a gentleman of truth and veracity,) held on the 28th of September last, stated that Mr. Birney professed to him to be a Democrat, and stated that he (Birney) would carry out Democratic principles."

Further deponent saith not. W. S. DRIGGS.

Sworn and subscribed before me, this 14th day of October, A. D. 1844.

THEO. WILLIAMS.
Justice of the Peace, Wayne Co. Michigan.

JAMES G. BIRNEY, AGAIN.

We have been favored with the perusal of a letter from a gentleman of the highest standing in Saginaw, relative to Mr. Birney's nomination by the Locofocos, and permitted to publish all that part of it which relates to that subject. The writer is well known to us, and his statements are entitled to the utmost reliance. They corroborate the facts published by us yesterday.—*Tribune.*

SAGINAW, Oct. 10, 1844.

Dear Sir:—I send you some copies of a handbill issued by the Locos of this city this morning, calling a Mass Meeting on Thursday of next week. The object of the meeting, as appears from the handbill, *is to counteract the facts which have gone abroad*, relative to the nomination of Mr. Birney by the Democratic party. How the party which nominated Mr. Birney can or will counteract the fact, is a problem to be solved.

At the Mass Meeting, there will be an effort to withdraw the nomination and start another on the course, but I cannot see how this will help the matter. One certain result will be, to disorganize the party, which are now pretty generally (some few excepted) united upon Mr. B. and create difficulties not very soon to be reconciled.

The facts relative to Mr. Birney's nomination, are well known here, and I think are becoming well known over the whole extent of our country. They are simply these—MR. BIRNEY SOUGHT THE NOMINATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—HE AVOWED HIMSELF A DEMOCRAT—PLEDGED HIMSELF, AS IS WELL UNDERSTOOD, TO SUPPORT DEMOCRATIC MEN AND MEASURES—AND FURTHER PLEDGED HIMSELF, IF ELECTED, NOT TO DISCUSS THE SUBJECT OF ABOLITIONISM IN THE LEGISLATURE. I have been assured by a gentleman present at the Convention, that these pledges were made at the nominating Convention, by the "*gentleman of truth and veracity*," alluded to in the handbill, on the behalf of Mr. B. and as was understood at the time, on the authority of Mr. B.

And the facts further are, that the party were well pleased with the new accession to their ranks—that some of them thought the nomination of Mr. B. would exhibit the maximum of political sagacity—and consequently, Mr. B. was regularly nominated, only three voting against him, as I have been told, on the formal ballot.

The facts further are, that Mr. Birney was pleased with the prospect of his being nominated by the Democratic party—and his statements to Frazer and Thompson, clearly show that he was determined to accept the nomination, if conferred upon him. The party may seek to cast off Mr. Birney, and Mr. B. to save appearances, may publicly decline the nomination, but it is too late—the thing is done, and cannot be undone.

Instructions from abroad, I imagine, are at the bottom of this movement. The leaders there of the party, think that something must be done to prevent, if possible, the Whig Abolitionists from withdrawing their support from Mr. Birney, and giving it to Mr. Clay.—*Detroit Daily Advertiser.*

Communications.

LETTER FROM JAMES FULTON, JR.

ERCILDOUN, Chester Co. Pa.
10th mo. 18th, 1844.

FRIEND GAY:—I regret the delay of my communications so long, as it will now seem to be impossible for this one to appear, and reach subscribers in this and some other States previously to the Presidential election. It being the conclusion of my reply, I should have been glad, if the views offered possess any weight, that they should have reached such friends of the cause as contemplate voting for Clay; with the hope that they still might be prevailed upon to withhold such vote; and that they might find something in what I propose to offer, adapted to that end.

I therefore again recur to the testimony which I left uncompleted in my last, to show that the South place the fullest confidence in Clay's friendly disposition towards the Annexation project.

Hear Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, the confidential friend of Clay, in a speech which was published in the Louisville Journal, Clay's leading organ in the South-west,—and an *Extra* of which, containing it, was distributed all over the South just before the Kentucky election:

"*As a friend to Texas*—as an American citizen, having no farther interest in the question of Annexation than a sincere desire to promote the welfare of the people of both countries—as one who acknowledges the justness of the Texan revolution—the full and perfect sovereignty of Texas so far as she was originally acknowledged by the Constitution of the Mexican United States, and as one who would *really desire* to see her single star added to the emblem of our own liberty, I am free to declare, that I regard Annexation *as more certain, speedy, sure*, on just and honorable terms, under the auspices of Mr. Clay, than under the guidance of his miserable competitor."

William C. Rives, one of Virginia's most distinguished sons, wrote a long letter to the *National Intelligencer* about the first of January, declaring his preference for Clay, over Van Buren, for the reasons that "new difficulties and troubles" may arise—"the Oregon and Texas questions, in our Foreign relations"—"the re-kindled fires of the abolition excitement"—threatening to "agitate our glorious Union to its centre,"—and that, therefore, Henry Clay "is the master spirit that may have power" to control and direct the angry elements.

The Philadelphia Ledger's Washington correspondent, has been repeatedly endorsed as good authority by the National Intelligencer, and he declared in a late letter, that "the best speech on the Texas question in the Senate, was made by the Hon. William C. Rives, who is *for* Annexation, and at the same time against the immediate execution of the measure, without the *consent* of Mexico. You may depend upon it, he *speaks from the cards*, for I should not be astonished, in case of Mr. Clay's election, to see him appointed Secretary of State, and in that capacity signing the very treaty for that purpose."

Here, then, are two distinguished men, both of whom, are openly talked of as likely to occupy posts in Clay's Cabinet, in case of his election; and who evidently consider the slave interest and Annexation *more secure* under Clay than under Van Buren or Polk. So, too, with hangman Preston, who a few years ago was rampant for immediate Annexation. *Now*, he deems it prudent to moderate his tone, and talk about the consent of Mexico, so that Clay may pass muster in some *shape* in the North. In a recent letter, I regret to say not now in my possession, he undertook to show that there was no "*good*" reason why South Carolina might not give him her vote—declaring that he (Clay) was the *only* Southern Whig known to be true to Southern institutions, who could at the same time carry the vote of the North—that happily, he had the confidence of the North, and that therefore there was hope of his success.

So, too, of Gen. Leslie Coombs, of Kentucky, the father, I presume, of the ill-fated boy, of Santa Fé notoriety, but restored through Mexican clemency. The General was a violent advocate for immediate Annexation, but since he has been placed upon the electoral ticket, the hope of success has counseled *prudence*, and he is *now for a season* satisfied with Annexation at the earliest practicable period.

Walsh, too, the Paris correspondent of the National Intelligencer—the same, I believe, who years ago, as editor of the National Gazette, first opened his columns to the laborious and devoted LUNDY, to expose and lay bare the Texas plot,—has declared, in a recent letter, that in France, Clay's letters are "considered as a promise of Annexation *in due time*,"—an evidence of the light in which his course is viewed by intelligent foreigners.

Should Clay be elected, is there not every probability that they will press immediate Annexation? The object gained, would not all disguise be thrown off? If it does not so result, the leopard will have changed his spots.

Again, a Georgian writing for the New-York Herald, says:

"We *Whigs* here, (as well as the Democrats,) say Texas too, but wait to do the thing that is right about it; and it *will not be four years* before the Democrats in our State will thank us for just holding them back in this favorite hobby, and permitting them to walk into the land of promise in a right way, instead of running out of Georgia between to lights, as many of them have done."

Even behold the servility of the North, when blind partisan feeling seizes the votaries of party. At the Whig mass meeting at Springfield, Massachusetts, a banner was borne in procession, with the motto, "*Not* wholly opposed to the Annexation if it can be accomplished with credit and honor."

Indeed, I know there are plenty of Whigs in my own county, perhaps a great majority, who would be perfectly content to see Annexation, provided Clay should effect it; for in that case they would be certain "it was the best thing." Who does not know that with many of them, it is merely a party cry—that there is not a particle of principle in it, and that they will sanction any measure, provided it be a measure of *the party*. Even in Massachusetts we find a similar sentiment prevails, and I fear my friend Child would not abhor the deed so much if Clay should finally perpetrate it. As an evidence, see in his last letter where Clay and some of the Liberty Party folks agree in opinion—how he palliates the former, and condemns the latter. But I am digressing. Have I not adduced abundant evidence that the Southern Whigs have the fullest confidence in Clay; that they are bent on the project of Annexation, and that they expect him to consummate the deed? That even the Northern wing of the party, would make but a feeble show of resistance, if Clay was but the *doer* of the act, and that therefore, we have nothing to hope on the score of any opposition, that may be claimed for him, to the measure.

Thus, we have seen the unvarying opinions and *practices* of Clay, from 1818 to the present time, and *now* the very worst sentiments of his long life, re-endorsed as his opinions still. We have seen his views upon Annexation expressed in three several letters, the last two expressly to satisfy the South; and we have also seen that the Southern Whigs are fully satisfied with him, and look for Annexation under his administration as "*more certain*" than under his "miserable competitor." True he has written yet another letter, seemingly with the design of springing astride Mason and Dixon's line, so that those, both north and south of that line may claim him as their own; but still he declares, that "there is not a feeling, or sentiment, or any opinion expressed in my *Raleigh* letter to which I do not adhere." After attending somewhat to his first letter, again endorsed, I shall then notice his last. His two Alabama letters, seemed evidently designed to interpret his Raleigh letter favorably to Southern views—affirming that he had no personal objection to Annexation, so "*far* from" it, that on the contrary, he would "be glad to see it, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms." In his Raleigh letter he has another leading objection, to wit:—"if without any danger to the integrity of the Union," &c; and in his second, or Tuscaloosa letter, he "would be unwilling to see the existing Union *dissolved* or *seriously* jeoparded, for the sake of acquring Texas."

Let us briefly examine these difficulties, which my friend Child and some others think insurmountable.

Rather than annex Texas with a Union "dissolved," or even "seriously jeoparded," he would do "without" it. In his third letter, of July 27th, he affirms that, "Above all, I should be governed by the *paramount* duty of preserving the Union *entire*," and that, too, just after affirming that, in case of his election, he "should be governed by the state of *fact*, and *the state of public opinion existing* at the time I might be called upon to act." What, then? He will not annex Texas, if the act should dissolve the Union. But what if *opposition* to the measure should dissolve the Union, or "seriously" jeopard its existence?—*that fact* being with him the "paramount" consideration—to be acted on, agreeably to "the state of public opinion existing at the time." Already have the States of South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi, passed resolutions in favor of Annexation, and some of them are clamorously demanding, or boldly averring that they will have dissolution. Large mass meetings of Southern hot bloods, have plainly avowed, that they would have the one or the other. Clay elected, these States, being chiefly democratic, their citizens, the partisan furies of Annexation or Dissolution, would become the *more* bold and inexorable on *that account*—seeing their *immediate* Annexation candidate was defeated: While the States of Ohio, Vermont, and Massachusetts, which have passed resolutions *against* Annexation—being *Whig* States, and the restraining influences to which we are to look, will not be likely,—although some of their editors and citizens have *talked* and *blustered* a little about dissolution in case of Annexation,—to make their opposition as strong, or as effectual, if Clay should occupy the Presidential chair, as if Polk should. I ask, where is the man who does not know that these opposing States would make nothing of that commotion in case of Clay consummating the deed, which they would make in case Polk should do it? Could Polk reconcile these Northern States to the deed?—impossible. Because they, as States, are opposed to the measure, and, because, politically, they are opposed to Polk—a very important consideration these degenerate times. Could Clay? If *any* man on earth could, that man is Clay. Because he is their own chosen candidate, and, because, like the "National Intelligencer," many of them are not so much opposed to the thing itself, as the man and the party by which it is to be accomplished.

They could much more easily be soothed and quieted. Why not? How could they dare to do otherwise, when he, with his known views, was their free choice? Under Clay, too, the restraining influences among the Democrats would not be so active *against* the measure. The Bentons and Wrights would feel, that if accomplished, the responsibility would not rest upon their party;—while upon the other hand, if Polk was elected, these Southern clamorers for dissolution, seeing the responsibility would rest upon their party, would not dare to be so urgent in their demands. Wright, and other great minds, would tremble, and halt long, very long, before they would take such a doubtful and fearful step,—while the land would *then* rock with the towering might of the opposition that would be arrayed against the measure in those opposing Northern States alluded to, and the design would be crushed forever. Finally, then, the clamor *for* dissolution would be greater under Clay than under Polk, in case the North should demur at Annexation; and the array of *opposition* to it would be *greater*, if an attempt should be made to effect it, under Polk, than under Clay: consequently, therefore, THE VERY CONTINGENCY would be *the more likely* to take place under Clay's administration, which he himself declares, would be "*above all*," with him, the "paramount duty," viz: "*preserving this Union entire.*"

Is not this conclusion fair—is it not irresistible? Does not the history of the man confirm it? Remember the "Missouri Compromise." Did not the North then make a greater show of opposition than it ever has in any case since? But the South threatened dissolution, and Clay true to his "paramount duty," insisted upon the admission of that State, although as part of the Louisiana territory, it had been unconstitutionally purchased by this Government; and thus was loose rein given to Slavery, and rude, fierce, and dictatorial, has been its uniform course ever since. Of this act, he has within a few months been making *public boast* in the South, which has been alluded to in a former part of this reply. Remember the "compromise" of '33, when the North, led on by Webster, took its stand, but the kingdom of South Carolina declared that she would "rend the Union" unless the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 were repealed. True again, to his "paramount duty," Clay introduced his "compromise bill," flung down his own principles, and again betrayed the North, for the sake of "preserving this Union."

When the question of Annexation shall come before Congress, with Clay as President—the Democrats going for the measure as a body, backed, as I have shown they will be, by the Southern Whigs, and urged on to the deed by the most clamorous threatenings of immediate dissolution, not merely by South Carolina, as in the former case, but by several other States in conjunction—thus, finally, carrying the measure by a majority of both Houses; what sober, intelligent, honest man, can doubt but what Clay would give the force of his signature to such a bill, or treaty, when superadded to the consideration, "above all" others, "paramount" with him, in deciding the question in favor of the South to prevent Dissolution,—he might also plead the opposition of his party, and his own long settled scruples about using the *Veto* Power. Would not such a majority, a supposition not at all far fetched, remove another difficulty, which runs through all his letters, to wit: an evidence of "the general concurrence of the nation," and a "general expression of public opinion" in favor of the measure? And if any of his Northern friends should tell him that his course had disappointed them, could he not point them to these declarations, just quoted, as the warrant for his course with far more propriety and plausibility, and with infinitely *less* of a stretched interpretation, than he has just given to his two Alabama letters, in his fourth and last letter, just out, where he gives a most laughable version of his words relative to having any personal objection to Annexation, and "should be glad to see it," &c.

And further, he utterly refused to pledge himself in his third letter, of July 27th, relative to the course he shall pursue, if elected, upon the Annexation question, but declares,—"I do not think it right to announce in advance what will be the course of a future administration in respect to a question with a foreign power." Why this refusal, or why the necessity of the Alabaminns asking the question, if they considered his Raleigh letter as pledging him against Annexation, until the difficulties at least could be removed? And why should Clay refuse, or why not point them to that letter for an exposition of his views *if it* contained them, and if it did not, why not state what his views were? But in the next sentence he says,—"I have NO HESITATION in saying that, far from having *any* personal objection to the Annexation of Texas, I SHOULD BE GLAD TO SEE IT, without dishonor, without war, with the common consent of the Union, and upon just and fair terms."

He would "be glad to see it" upon these terms, but he does not say that he would *not* sanction the measure upon *other* terms, although he might not be quite so "*glad.*" The best terms always please us most, of course. Whether he would or not, he refuses to say, and therefore evidently forbids us taking what *he did say*, as a contingent pledge of his future course, for he expressly *declines* informing us, (or the Alabamians—and most likely, it was us he feared,) "by what policy" he "would be guided in the event of his election as Chief Magistrate of the United States, in reference to the question of the Annexation of Texas." What, then, are the terms. He would be glad to see it without dishonor, war, &c. but these are not the terms. These he refuses to give. Yet oh! miserable infatuation, these are the terms which my friend Child and others proclaim, as the *necessary* prerequisites to Annexation, and then claiming that *these* are insurmountable, conclude, that under Clay, all is well. Oh! the swindling character of these letters, and the sorcery influence they seem to hold over all who come within the influence of the cunning incantations of their author.

Refusing to give us all his opinions, we are left to infer that if the South should demand Annexation at the point of Dissolution, he would then favor the measure as a "Government duty," and as "above all" others of war, &c.; and that, that fact itself would be evidence of the "general concurrence of the nation," in behalf of the scheme, for in the settlement of any great national question, the *nation of the South*, has invariably been considered *the* nation, and every man at all conversant with the history of our Government, *knows* this to be true, and shall we look, or even hope for a course *less* devoted in his allegiance to the all-controlling power of Slavery, on the part of the great swindling High Priest of the order? Ridiculous the expectation, forlorn the hope, as his whole life bears witness.

Still, however, I will examine these difficulties further, not because they are really governing difficulties, in Clay's mind but because some of his friends think they are; and even these, I think, I shall be able to show can be removed, and in all probability will be removed, if Clay is elected, for of all men, he is the very one, who can remove them, if such a thing is possible.

"Loss of national character," and "hazard of foreign war," vanish, upon Mexico giving her consent, and another, giving "an unreasonable price for Texas," or the "just and fair terms" disappear, when he declares in his third letter, that he should be glad to see it, without dishonor, war, &c.; and in his Raleigh letter, affirms, that if annexed, "the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, *be its amount what it may.*" The remaining two—"the general concurrence of the nation," and the "danger to the integrity of the Union," I have already noticed.

First, then, to the contingency, the consent of Mexico; upon which hangs the removal of the first two objections. What is it, after all, but a contingency which may disappear in a month. If it can be removed by negotiation, Clay is the man that can effect it. Possessing great diplomatic experience, and having professed deference to the claims of Mexico, and hostility to the measure so long as she should press her opposition, that Government might listen to Clay's administration; but Polk, announcing his buccaneer principle of *immediate* Annexation, regardless of the opposition of Mexico, would, therefore stand no chance whatever of a hearing at all, to say nothing of a favorable hearing; but his offers would be rejected with disdain. Benton, and other Democrats, might through Clay do something, but through Polk, all their efforts would be wasted, because Mexico would not listen to such an Executive.

Again, Mexico, at this moment, is preparing to invade Texas with a strong military force, but she may again meet with another San Jacinto defeat. One or two foreign powers are, and have been, striving to adjust the difficulty between them. Discouraged with the failure of repeated attempts to reduce to obedience her refractory subjects, together with a drained treasury, she may at last be induced to acknowledge the independence of Texas: or Texas, at the suggestion and connivance of the Slave Power of *this* country, may propose to treat with Mexico, by a proposition to abolish Slavery, (this being one of the original causes of difficulty,)—with a view of its re-establishment, by Annexation to the United States, and thus, by false pretences, effect a reconciliation: or, we have claims against the Government of Mexico of long standing; we may press these claims in an arrogant manner purposely to provoke retaliation; and finally our Government, another name merely for the Slave Power, would effect with great professions of regret and solemn gravity, the necessity of redressing our own "*grievances*" by the invasion of Mexico, and probably by seizing upon Texas. None of these are at all strained suppositions, but in strict agreement with our past treatment of Mexico, as well as of various Indian tribes. But further, Clay shows in his Raleigh letter, that he only seeks a *plausible occasion*, to lay violent hands upon this portion of Mexican territory; and beautifully exhibits his cloven-footed predispositions to that end.

War, war, with Mexico, and perhaps other foreign powers, is one of the great difficulties alluded to by Clay, as the inevitable result of Annexation, without the consent of the former; and yet, in a certain contingency, of a most trivial nature—at least one that would by no means warrant our interference,—he declares that he should "regard it as the imperative duty of the Government of the United States to oppose to such designs the most firm and determined resistance, to the extent, *if necessary*, of *appealing to* ARMS, to *prevent* the accomplishment of any such designs." And what are the "designs" here alluded to? Simply, that "if any European nation entertains any ambitious designs upon Texas, *such as that of* COLONIZING her, or in *any* way subjugating her." Still this does not seem very definite, and we shall have to seek a further explanation of what he means, when he declares in the same letter, that England has "solemnly disavowed" any "intention to interfere in her "*domestic institutions.*" So England, as usual, is *the* European nation" that is suspected, and the "domestic institutions" of Texas the point of attack by the "designs." How are these designs to be manifested? Why, by such means as "colonizing her, or in *any* way subjugating her." So Clay reckons colonizing one of the *ways* of subjugating Texas, and England, with her West India Islands at hand, being the most convenient to that end, is of course the most suspected of the design of "colonizing her," notwithstanding she has "disavowed" any "intention" of interfering in her "peculiar" affairs, not deeming, I suppose, that sending off some of her emigrants there would be such interference. But then England is full of abolition sentiment, and whether she would colonize Texas with some of her West Indian freedmen, or with the free white peasantry of her realm, still *such* "colonizing" might *subjugate* Texas. What kind of subjugation? Most evidently not the Republic of Texas, but merely her "domestic institutions"—not to conquer and reduce Texas to a British province, but to subvert her slave system.

That is the "subjugating" process feared by this great champion of colonizing Africa with Americans. Wonder what he would think of Britain threatening his colonization society, or his country, with war, because he and others, fostered by some of the States of this Union, chose to colonize Liberia? Every one knows such threats would be spurned. But if any European nation should imitate our example, and colonize Texas, Clay will resist it, even to the "appealing to arms." The avowal is nothing short of a declaration, that he is fully prepared to involve this nation in a war, to uphold and perpetuate Slavery, not only in our own country, but in a foreign land. Most shameful and disgraceful declaration. One that goes further than any which even Polk has made. He is for immediate annexation, but possibly he *may* think that it can be effected without war,—at least he nowhere declares that he will effect it *with* war, if need be. But Clay, while deprecating war for the sake of Annexation—is fully prepared for war to sustain Slavery—not in our own States, but among a foreign and distinct people—fearing, of course, that if Slavery was subjugated in Texas, it would dangerously affect "similar institutions" in the United States.

There is nothing strange in all this, for it is the studied course of the Slave Power in similar cases, and when, too, it had a *similar agent.*

In May 1826, Clay, as Secretary of State, instructed our Ministers, Anderson and Sergeant, appointed to represent our Government in the Congress of *Panama*, to resist the intention of the new Republics of Colombia and Mexico of invading Cuba, and the *attendant* consequences of the abolition of Slavery in that Island by the emancipating armies of those Republics, on the ground of "the *contagion* of such near and dangerous examples" to our slave population; and the instructions threatened, in case of further persistance in the measure of such invasion, "to employ *all* the means necessary" to prevent it. Our Ministers at the Courts of St. Petersburgh and Madrid were likewise instructed by Clay—the first, to press the Russian Government to interpose its friendly offices with the King of Spain, to induce him to make peace with his refractory colonies, and the latter to the same end, that the abolition of Slavery might be prevented in Cuba.

This, then, is the man, who would not endanger the peace of the country "for the sake of annexing Texas." I ask my friend Child where is the guaranty? It is not found in his past life, or in his late letters.

But admitting all this, my friend inquires, "whether the main political reliance of the friends of justice, humanity, and universal emancipation, must not necessarily, in this country, be placed upon the Whig party? And this Whig party goes *security* for Henry Clay's fidelity to *their known* principles and habits of action, and their long established system of policy."

A poor "reliance," some of us think. To rely upon such a party, would be to lean upon a broken reed—it would be hewing out cisterns that could hold no water.

We are pointed to the sessions of the Whig Congress of 1841-'2, and '42-'3 in which the gag was repealed by majorities of 8 and 4 votes. Admit it. Did not a Democratic Congress at the last session repeal it by a majority of 20 votes?—and after there had been more discussion upon it than ever before. But then he may reply, perhaps, that the Democrats refused to adopt the rules as amended. True, and so did the Whig Congress, or that that was equivalent to it, and that too, at the instance of J. Q. Adams, whom Child styles "as confessedly the leader of the Whigs in the House of Representatives, as he is of those favorable to abolition."

Well, Adams being the "*leader*" of this abolition Whig party, let us make a single inquiry or two about his abolition principles.

He is opposed to the immediate abolition of Slavery in the United States. He is opposed to it in the District of Columbia. To a committee of the colored people of Pittsburgh, he declared,—"Let the people of Africa—let the sovereigns of Africa—let the Republics of Africa, if such there be, let them abolish Slavery *at home*, and Slavery will be abolished in America!" Ludicrous! Well, like Priest—like people. So if friend Child claims affinity with such as *these*, I hope he may not any longer claim to be an Abolitionist.

Next we are referred to the vote of the Whig party "on the 13th of February, 1837, and on the 1st and 2d of March following," as being very strong "against the recognition of the independence of Texas." Be it so. They had not Clay in their keeping *then*; for he was *the man*, who, on the 8th of June, 1836, introduced a resolution in the Senate *for* its recognition, and in reply to a remark from Preston, (whom Child would gladly disown as a Whig,) said, that he would be extremely glad to receive information which would authorize *stronger measures in favor of Texas.*

Did not Webster, almost as great an "embodiment of Whig principles" as Clay—a non-slave-*owner*, too, pledge Harrison's administration in advance, in Virginia, "beneath an October sun," to the slave interest, in all its requirements; and afterwards, as Secretary of State, plead the unconstitutional cause of the slave claimants of the Creole heroes, at the footstool of the British throne?

Harrison, too, the successful chieftain of "1840,"—the member of the old Abolition Society of Virginia—did he not, in the first act of his official career as President, declare in his Inaugural Address, that the whole Anti-Slavery movement, was "the certain harbinger of disunion, violence, and civil war"?—gave a "veto pledge" that the efforts of those who were seeking to effect abolition in the District of Columbia, should "never be realized"?—and condemned the mere "agitation" of this question as "productive of no other consequences than bitterness, alienation and discord"? And did not every Whig orator and Whig press in the land shout a long and loud amen to the Message? Did not this same President make up his Cabinet of slaveholders, and "October sun" men, excepting *one Granger*, of New-York, and he was required to say that he was no Abolitionist, and was told that if he ever became one, the President would deem it sufficient ground for his removal from office! Was not the Philadelphia Postmaster, under the same rule, *required* to remove [or resign himself] our faithful friend *Joshua Coffin*, poor as he was in the world's substance, from the humble office of letter carrier, because he was a known Abolitionist?

To pass by volumes of similar testimony to the Anti-Slavery character of this noble party, which time and limits will not allow me to allude to,—allow me to advert to some of the late doings of that "Whig Senate," so frequently pointed to as the safeguard of our rights. Of the nominations made last session for the confirmation of the Senate, there were from the *North*, Spencer, of New-York, *rejected*, Henshaw, of Massachusetts, do., Isaac Hill, of New Hampshire, do., Chancellor Walworth, of New-York, do., Ex-Governor Shannon, of Ohio, kept hanging in suspense for six months, and Wilkins, of this State, *an Annexationist, confirmed.*

From the *South*, and confirmed, *Gilmore*, of Virginia, Nelson, of Maryland, Mason, of Virginia, J. C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, H. A. Wise, of Virginia, W. R. King, of Alabama; and all of them, *with Wilkins*, were accepted *instantly*, without any hesitation, and out of great deference to Calhoun, the *usual forms* of the Senate had to be dispensed with, in honor of the nullifier.

Now mark,—*all* that were *confirmed*, are, or were, leading plotters of the immediate annexation scheme; and thus they were put into the very posts where they could have controlling influence in its favor. Wise, even, mad with Southern frenzy—the furious assailant of petition, the threatener of Church robbing in Mexico, must be commissioned to Brazil,—and even the miserable caterer, Cushing, must have the lucrative mission to the Celestial Empire assigned him, for his fealty to Slavery and Tyler. But I must not enlarge.

If a Whig party has done these things, *what may it not do?* And what is the guaranty in behalf of the party worth, to hold in check such a controlling genius as Clay, bound up hand and foot, soul and body, in the slave interest?

Again, friend Child is very indignant that the Baltimore Convention should have "boldly and shamelessly turned their backs upon their past professions," disregarded their "deliberate instructions," and thrown Van Buren overboard to make room for Polk, the unknown; because the former "was not willing to sacrifice everything for Texas and Slavery." My own mind is fully impressed with the truth of this, but then an impartial mind can see that the very same dictatorial principle was at work in the Whig Convention. Sergeant, Fillmore, Davis, and McLean, were all thrown aside to make room for one as unthought of as Polk, and according to the editor of the New-York "Tribune," this nomination was "substantially settled" in a "caucus of the Southern members" the evening previous to the nomination, and the balloting shows, that throughout, the Southern delegates from *every State* clung to him, until the friends of the other gentlemen gave way, as usual, and the Slave Power got both nominations filled with their own creatures—not being willing to allow a crumb, these difficult times, to Northern feeling. The "institutions" are in a critical way, and they must be guarded at all points, and well, will Frelinghuysen, always the bitter foe of our cause, act out the commands of his superior. Where, now, is the sympathy of my friend in this case, with the "deceived, defrauded, and insulted" Whigs.

Again he asks, "if it has taken forty years to fill up Louisiana and Florida, so as at length to begin to make the price of slaves descend," "how long will it take to fill up Texas?" This question is greatly calculated to deceive the people—assuming the very point to be proved, viz: That Louisiana and Florida, *are* filled up. It will take years, and millions of slaves, to fill up these vast regions, which are as yet, to a great extent, an unsettled wilderness.

In his closing paragraphs, he quotes some very humane sentiments from Henry Clay. This is all chaff, when Clay, so late as September 2d, in his letter to Wickliffe, disavowing the *honesty*, which C. M. Clay had the *dishonesty*, or most culpable ignorance, to attribute to him,—declares, that he still adheres to his atrocious Senate views of '39, "*without* ANY *reservation.*"

He charges "Liberty Party leaders," with turning a "sudden somerset on Texas," and even advocating its annexation. I know of none such myself, but I certainly do know, that if he calls the able editor of the Cincinnati Philanthropist, one of the "leaders," then is he in error, for I believe that paper has done more to defeat the project, than all the efforts of my friend Child, and as many more as go with him for the election of either Clay or Polk. If any of that party should favor it, it would be nothing more, I believe, than our friend Foster, and some others of that school,—taking for their motto,—"our country is the world—our countrymen are all mankind"—do, believing that by Annexation, and the consequent growth of Anti-Slavery sentiment, that the slaves of Texas could be more speedily released from their bonds, than if independent of this Government, and that the freedom of our own would not be retarded by it.

But after all, can Polk effect his object of immediate Annexation, if he should be elected? I believe it utterly impossible. We know the views of the present Congress, and the new one, whatever may be the complexion of its opinions on this question, cannot, or will not be likely to be called to act on it, for more than a year hence. Public sentiment would thus have time to manifest itself, and two elections intervening, there would be full time and opportunity to canvass the subject, and strengthen our force to the most commanding influence, by either withdrawing from the pro-slavery parties, or by concentrating upon candidates of our own. A strong array of this order could not fail to have a controlling influence over both parties. Neither party would feel quite sure they were safe, if they believed that ten thousand voters in each of the free States, had withheld their suffrages from them, owing to this question. Withhold our votes from Clay, and while the Whig party will not respect us less, the Democratic will much more. Vote for Clay, and what is the language of our ballot? Merely, that we are in favor of Annexation at the earliest practicable period. Vote for him, and still Polk may be elected, we would gain nothing with the Whigs—would lose all our hold upon the Democrats; and out of disgust, and what they would justly consider our treachery, they would most certainly be led to hasten the project of Annexation, out of revenge, if nothing else, at our hypocrisy. The division upon the subject among themselves would then be healed, and we might expect those of their party heretofore opposed to the measure, to come forward and support it. Silas Wright opposes it on the same groun

upon "*just* and admissible *terms*." Well, if he does not *now* possess "information" how it could be effected upon the immediate principle, upon "admissible terms," perhaps he will find out how it can be rendered "just," by his judicious arrangement of *present* difficulties, in case of his election. I cannot see, "according to any information I possess," how the public debt of this State is to be liquidated—nevertheless it most certainly can be done, and if I try hard, I may eventually see, if I do not at present.

These "admissible terms," are evidently the debt of Texas; and the reason why Annexation "could not be effected," while this difficulty obtains, he informs us, in the closing paragraph but one, of his letter, where he allludes to a speech delivered in the Senate three years ago, *against* "the assumption by the General Government of the debts of the several States." Of course, now that this *last* letter strives to place one foot on this side of Mason and Dixon's line, he desires *us* to infer that he would be unwilling to assume the debt of Texas, and *therefore*, Annexation cannot take place.

Ah! but we have not forgotten that he still adheres to his Raleigh letter in every feeling, sentiment, and opinion. Well, we will just put this, and that together. In that letter, he declares, that "should Texas be annexed to the Union, the United States will assume and become responsible for the debt of Texas, *be its amount what it may*. In the former part of the same letter he says, in summing up the difficulties in the way of Annexation, that if it could be effected "without giving *any* unreasonable price for Texas," other difficulties out of the way, that then if the "question" was presented, it would appear in *quite a different light*, from that in which I apprehend, it is now to be regarded." So, then, a *reasonable* "price" might do? And to the assumption of a reasonable foreign debt, he might give his assent—it would appear, then, in quite such a "different light," that it would be "admissible." Again, in his Alabama letters, he had no personal objection, and would be glad to see it, upon "just and fair terms." Why talk about "fair terms," and "price," &c. if he is not prepared for "assumption"? Assuming that we shall have to shoulder the debt, "be its amount what it may," we can therefore the more easily appreciate the closing words of his *re-endorsed* Raleigh letter, that Annexation would be "inexpedient in the *present* financial condition of the country." Again, I demand, if the assumption of the Texas debt, is the consideration that makes the idea of Annexation *not* admissible, even if *all, all* other difficulties were removed,—then why allude to our "financial condition"? But further, this letter was written in April—since then, our "financial condition" has greatly improved—ten millions I am told are now in the Treasury, and our own debt paid off. Does not this make way for the "admissible conditions?" A bad thing this, that in writing his last letter, he should have endorsed his first. Even passing by his first, and taking the last; what does the obstruction to Annexation, of the "assumption" of the Texas debt amount to? It is only necessary for her to manage her debt in some other way, than burdening us with it, and then the "admissible conditions" are at hand.

The whole letter is a miserable twistification of conflicting opinions, with those he had just a few days previously written, and designed, no doubt, to swindle the North out of its common sense and sagacity. When will our citizens learn that no slaveholder is to be trusted, where the question of Slavery is staked, no more than a purse swindler is to be trusted when silver is within his stealthy grasp. Re-examine all those letters in conjunction; glance over the whole history of the man, friends of the slave, and see whether you do not see throughout, the marks of a thoroughly skilled political trimmer, who would encompass any amount of deception and fraud, to cheat freemen out of their principles, to subserve his ambitious aims?

I earnestly entreat that they may stand firm in this trial hour, of the slave's greatest need. Better that Texas should be annexed, than we should deviate a hair's breadth? for in firmness lies our strength. Let the deed be done—and indeed the degradation may be allotted us, to startle this already reeling, drunken land from its state of complete stupor, to life and energy—rousing it, as with an earthquake shock, from its dreamy indifference to the slave, to procure mighty results for freedom. Even then the so much dreaded Annexation might prove the occasion of awakening into life that healthy circulation of discussion and opinion, which would, in a brief period make it utterly impossible for any portion of the territory to be admitted into this Union as a slave State.

That my friend Child and others, may give these considerations their due weight, is all that is asked by *his* and *their* friend, J. FULTON, Jr.

P.S. May I, by way of a postscript, add something further, touching other matters? I have read, with perfect astonishment, J. S. Gibbons's "Appeal," in the last Standard. Personally, he is unknown to me, but by reputation he had secured my entire confidence. I am amazed. An appeal to the Abolitionists of the country to vote for Henry Clay! Suppose they should; I cannot but think he would feel sorry to witness it. And still, suppose Clay should be defeated, what a pitiable position we should occupy. He talks about the Whig press, and Whig Senators and others, Webster, Choate, &c. as speaking out in our behalf. Webster had many fine opportunities in the Senate of advocating our principles, of abolition, of petition, rebuking Preston, &c.—when did he avail himself of them? So had Choate, and his colleague, Bates—and did they speak out in the Senate? When the Massachusetts Resolutions were flung back in their faces, where, then, were their tongues of eloquence? Mute, mute! And so they would have been during this canvass, had we all adopted J. S. Gibbons's course. It is the pressure of our numbers that has forced them to speak out. Consent to vote their tickets, and we shall not hear a murmur from their lips upon the subject, in the course of one year, nor from their presses. Why did the Whigs of Vermont take up Wm. Slade? because they hoped to catch those who had previously refused to vote with them. Why are they just now everywhere talking abolition like a Garrison or Birney? Because they desire us to vote with them. Had we done so heretofore, they would have felt under no necessity to talk *now*, being secure of our votes.

Now, I maintain the counsel of the appeal is to smother up the discussion, if followed, and present us another slaveholder, in 1848, for our suffrages; while, if our course is pursued, there never will be another such man presented to the people, for the reason that he cannot get the people's votes. But do as friends Child and Gibbons propose to, and we may have Clays and Calhouns forever.

He seems to fear the result in our State, and some others. So much the more controlling will be our influence. The more evident our balancing power, the more encouraging to apply our test to the parties closely, until they shall nominate anti-slavery men all out. I am glad to believe that such counsel will be lost upon our State. The effort he makes to show something like a coalition between the Democrats and Liberty men, looks rather partisan-like—designed to operate upon Whig friends of the cause, but the object will fail of its mark. Those of us who can't vote for Liberty men, will stay at home. I must stop, and refer him to my reply to Child, as a further reply to himself. J. F. jr.

FROM OUR JAMAICA CORRESPONDENT.

KINGSTON, JAMAICA, Aug. 25, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR,—In these days, when such imperfect and false views are entertained in regard to the working of Emancipation in the British West Indies, it becomes the duty of those living in that portion of the world where the "experiment" is going on, to refute and expose the false statements, and assertions which the enemies of the holy cause of Emancipation have put forth to the world as the result of giving liberty to the negroes. But I trust the Abolitionists, (particularly that portion which I consider myself connected with—the old and true Anti-Slavery party of America,) will with great caution, listen to, or take the report of the enemies of freedom, as they are so destitute of truth. Every traveller whose mind has not been blinded by prejudice, or preconceived opinions, against the system has concurred in declaring that the "experiment" has worked in the most satisfactory manner to all parties, and that the negroes have worked cheerfully and willingly for fair and just wages; and have behaved themselves like freemen, respecting and obeying the laws of their rightful *Sovereign* and conducting themselves in the most peaceable manner. I can declare, Sir, from five years' residence in the Island, as a schoolmaster, that they are the most moral, religious, well-disposed, and peaceable people I have ever known. I may also state here, to show that they are not lazy, that more than 30,000 of the emancipated have purchased their own freehold, and are contentedly carrying on the cultivation of coffee, &c. &c. Does this look like laziness? Surely not. I regret, Sir, my time will not permit me to say more. Your obedient servant,

HENRY W. DAVISON

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1844.

Take Notice.—There is a paper published in this city, called the New-York Standard, and letters and papers intended for us, often get miscarried to that office. Ou friends and correspondents will please be sure and direc to us, as the *Anti-Slavery* Standard.

PRICE OF A THIRD PARTY PRESIDENT.

The marketable value of a man in the political shambles, is often a somewhat difficult matter to determine. A good deal of higgling and chaffering as to the price of the article usually precedes the striking of the bargain. "It is naught, it is naught," saith the buyer; but when he goeth his way, then he boasteth himself." It is seldom that a man is taken at'his own upset price,—unless indeed he be worth any money, or else has very moderate ideas as to his own value. At the head of this last class of *modest* men, Mr. Birney, the candidate for the Third Party, for the Presidency, certainly deserves to be placed. He has set his party, and to the world an example of singular moderation. "THE MODERATE," would be a title more appropriate as well as more deserved, as I believe I have already shown to the satisfaction of most of men, than that of "THE JUST." He is the Diogenes, rather than the Aristides, of the New World. Diveletian, cultivating cabbages at Salona, does not present a more striking contrast to Diveletian on the throne of the Cæsars, than does the Democratic candidate for the county of Saginaw, to the candidate of the Party of Purity for the Presidency of the United States. When Gulliver visited the Academy of Projectors, at Lagado, in his voyage to Laputa, he found a plan proposed for the adjustment of taxation so as to satisfy everybody. It was, that every one should be taxed on those qualities on which they most prized themselves, and that every one's possessions should be taken at his own estimation. Should this system ever be adopted in this country, it must be on the principle of "the sliding scale," in order to adjust itself now to the pretensions of the Third Party candidate for the Presidency, and now to those of the Democratic candidate for the House of Assembly of Michigan.

From my knowledge of the conduct of the leaders of the Third Party in times past towards the Abolitionists, I was prepared to expect that they would sell the party in the gross, or themselves in detail, whenever they could make a bargain to their mind. I was not, therefore, at all surprised when I was told by a country newspaper, that Mr. Birney had been nominated by the Democrats of Michigan for Congress. I only thought to myself that he had done remarkably well for himself; that like Moses in the Vicar of Wakefield, "he was a discreet boy, and could buy and sell to very good advantage." This opinion was a little modified when the Boston Advertiser informed me that it was not for Congress, but for the State Senate, that Mr. Birney had been the choice of the Democracy of Michigan. But still, I thought there might be a lustre investing a Curule Chair of Michigan, dazzling to the eyes of one in its neighborhood, which was lost to ours in the intervening distance. But what was my horror and astonishment, when I found by the Atlas of October 21st, that it was notfor the chance of a seat among the collective wisdom of the nation, nor even for the hope of being enrolled among the Conscript Fathers of his adopted State, but only for the possibility of a place in its lower house, that the Sage of Saginaw, "Birney the Just," the "Fragrant Cedar," the immaculate candidate of the Third Party for the Chair of State, had laid himself and his party, at the feet of Young Hickory! I was not at all surprised at the bargain and sale; but I must confess I *was* amused at the *consideration*. This was going up like a rocket, and coming down like the stick, with a vengeance. I could not but remember George Selwyn's exclamation when Babb Doddington made one of his many tergiversations on very small provocation: "I always believed with Sir Robert, (Walpole) that every man had his price; and there are some men that are to be had dog cheap!" Presidential candidates must be dog-cheap in Michigan, if they are to be had on these terms. Mr. Birney certainly showed a due appreciation of the great axiom of politics—that half a loaf is better than no bread. If he cannot be President of the United States—to be a Michigan representative, is doubtless, better than nothing. President Madison used to tell a story of a zealous patriot who came to him for public employment. He should like the Secretaryship of State, or one of the other departments. They were all, unfortunately, filled. A foreign mission would suit him; but they were bespoken. A Collectorship, or Postoffice would not be refused. There were no vacancies. "Was there any place whatever that he could have?" The President regretted that he had nothing to give him. "Well, then," persisted the persevering aspirant, in conclusion, "has your Excellency such a thing as an *old pair of breeches* that you could let me have?"

Whether the Third Party will feel disposed to continue to Mr. Birney his title of THE JUST, after the scurvy trick that he has played them, is no concern of mine. If his selling himself at any rate would have been an injury to them, the price for which he has done it, is an insult. If this be the value in the political market of the Head of the Party, what in the name of infinitesimal fractions can the rank and file expect to get? He has certainly done his best to make his party ridiculous and contemptible. But this is not all the just cause of complaint they have against him. His manner of doing it showed as little regard for their common sense, as it did for his own political consistency or personal honor. In his letter to the Tribune, he tried to make it appear that if he were nominated, that it was on local grounds, independent of party consideration, his opposition to both the parties being as well understood there as here. As if a political party ever selected a man for any office, on whom they could not depend! But now we have the testimony of the gentleman who had waited upon Mr. Birney to ascertain his willingness to be a candidate, and what his course would be, if elected; and what does he say? That Mr. Birney replied, that he was quite willing to accept the nomination, and would, if elected, serve the county to the best of his abilities, and REFRAIN FROM AGITATING THE QUESTION OF ABOLITION IN THE HOUSE!! This gentleman, (Mr. Garland,) further states that he has a letter from Mr. Birney, to the same effect, which he will produce if his statement be denied. It is also in evidence, as well by the testimony of Mr. Garland, as of distinct witnesses, that Mr. B. professed "to be a Democrat, and promised, if elected, to carry out Democratic principles!" That is to say, (unless he intended to palter in a double sense with his new party, as well as with his old one,) that he would go with the party, in all that it had, at that time, adopted as its policy,—Texas, Oregon, and all! I wish the Democratic party joy of its acquisition, and hope that he will serve them better than he did the American Anti-Slavery Society when he was in their pay. They must take him into their service, however, at their own risk. They must not expect a character from his last place.

So much for the Presidential candidate of the Third Party. How is it with Mr. Morris, its candidate for the Vice Presidency? Mr. Gibbons, in a letter to the Standard, of the 17th instant, makes the following statement, on the authority of a gentleman whose name he does not feel at liberty to mention, but whom I will take a Yankee's privilege of *guessing* to be Theodore D. Weld, Esq. He said, "that Thomas Morris, of Ohio, at the very time of his nomination, held the opinion THAT COLORED MEN OUGHT TO BE DEBARRED THE EXERCISE OF THE ELECTIVE FRANCHISE,—and I know farther, that THE LEADERS OF THE PARTY WERE AWARE OF THE FACT AT THE TIME OF HIS NOMINATION!" He further says, that he had made this statement to Mr. Birney* and to Mr. Chaplin, neither of whom denied its truth. And yet the principal organs of the party that support these two men, for the highest places in the nation, have the assurance to talk about a coalition between "the Garrisonians" and the Whigs! And this, because we have presumed to mete out impartial justice to Mr. Birney, as well as to Mr. Clay, and to Mr. Polk. Mr. Garrison can answer for himself, but I know that no fair-minded person can deny that since the Standard has been in the charge of its present editors, it has been conducted with perfect impartiality towards all three of the political parties. Its editors have their own political opinions on the questions that divide the country, aside from Slavery; but what they are is nobody's business, provided they are not urged in the columns of the American Society's organ. The vision that can detect Whiggism in the Standard, would see it in Mr. McDuffie's speeches, if there were occasion for the discovery.

Whatever the political opinions of the editors of this paper may be, they are held in infinite subordination to their Anti-Slavery principles. We look upon Free Trade and Protection, upon Independent Treasury, and National Bank, as things that cannot, either in their presence or their absence, materially affect the national prosperity, as long as Slavery is permitted to paralyze the hearts, to pervert the moral sense, and to consume the industry of the country. We shall go on in the straight path of primitive abolition, in which we have always walked. Whenever the political, or the religious, parties of the day, will give us any honest help in our work, we will render them all due honor, and make the best use we can of their assistance. If any of them place themselves across our path, we shall do our utmost to remove them out of the way. We have no counsel with any party or sect, as such, but we have an undying, an indomitable hatred of PRO-SLAVERY, under whatever disguise it may seek to screen itself. And the more it attempts to pass itself off as ANTI-SLAVERY, the more do we feel bound to expose its real character, and to defeat its selfish ends. And for this purpose, we shall select such times and places as seem to us best adapted for our design. Some of the Third Party presses have complained, with a simplicity worthy of the pastoral ages, that we have selected *this time* for our exposure of Mr. Birney's character! As if the eve of an election were not the time of all others for the discussion of the claims of a candidate for political office! Others may do as they like, but when we have anything to say, we always choose to speak when we have an audience. And this course we shall continue to pursue until we are convinced that it is unwise or impolitic.—Q.

* Mr. Gibbons's correction in regard to Mr. Birney, was made since the above was written.—G.

THE ELECTION.

A few days more, and the momentous question of who shall bePresident, will be decided. The whole country is breathless with expectation. The opposing armies are everywhere mustering their forces. Every art of strategy, every means of doing successful battle, every method of honorable, and many of dishonorable warfare, have been brought into preliminary action, and arranged for the grand result. No soldier sleeps at his post. No tactics are there that have been unstudied; no man so dull that does not know his place, and his supposed duty, and none in all the hosts that is not ready to do all, and dare all for victory. The sight of the flaming cross never spread wilder enthusiasm among the clans of the Highlands, than the rallying cry of party, carried upon the thousand-winged press, spreads among the people who are gathering, at the word, in tens and hundreds of thousands to decide what slaveholder shall next govern them,—under which form of tyranny they shall next be trampled.

Surely this is a great country. A noble, a Christian, a moral, a liberty-loving, and a free people are we. Let the tyrants in other lands tremble; let the oppressed everywhere clap their hands for joy, and lift up their voices in glad thanksgiving; let the priests who minister at Freedom's altars, where the fire glimmers dimly, "seize the half-burning brand, and shake it at the stars." Once more does a mighty Republic say to all the world, "See now the success of Republican Institutions! Look again at the sublime sight of a free people choosing their Rulers! The rich and the poor, the high and the low, here alike are Kings! Here all men are equal! Here is the home of Freedom, and every hearth-stone is her altar, and every man her priest!" Especially shall not the slave rejoice, as he skulks to his master's home at the firing of the evening gun in the cities, or creeps, on the plantation to his wretched cabin, to forget in sleep—his only blessing—his wrongs, till aroused again to weary unrequited toil by the early call of the driver's horn? Is it not also to him of great importance who shall be President? Has he not a great interest in this *fact* of Republicanism? Should he not also hang out his banners, and make the welkin ring with his shouts, and sing the apotheosis of the Fathers who left this heir-loom of Liberty to their children? Oh! but this *is* a great country,—great in its hypocrisy,—great in its unrepented sin,—great in its national scoundrelism,—great in its treachery to Liberty,—great in its base betrayal of the rights of humanity which God had entrusted in its hands. Sublime even in its unmitigated wickedness, in that, that no people since the world begun have had so fully given to them, both by local position, and by a clear recognition of the truth, which ages had labored to establish, the means of working out the great problem of free Government; and never has any people, up to this point, more fully and completely failed in fulfilling their mission. Now, after half a century of trial, it is of as little consequence who shall be the next occupant of the White House, as it was in the decline of the Roman Empire who should sit upon the Byzantine throne. Now, as then, the Cæsar must be "born in the purple," and it matters little else. True to tyranny, and true to nothing beside, the besotted people will elevate a slaveholder to reign over them, and calmly, or ignorantly, raise again a throne for four years longer on the ruins of their own rights, and the accumulating heap of the slave's wrongs.

But, thank God, it will not be so always. We have reached the beginning of the end. This is the death-struggle of the slave power. We may at least hazard the conjecture that these States under the present Constitution will never have another President; and we may predict with certainty, that never shall another be chosen who is not true in his own person at least, to so much of Anti-Slavery as is growing fast to be claimed as the "Peculiar Institution" of the North. The party lines are breaking up. Even in this contest he who is claimed to be the least pro-slavery is most likely to be chosen, and for this very reason. On this ground chiefly, and almost solely, has the battle been fought. The few true Anti-Slavery presses, and the free and earnest, but apparently disregarded voices of a few Anti-Slavery lecturers, and the comparative handful of men and women, who, never swerving from the line of their duty to the slave and themselves, remain true in all this din of political turmoil, and excitement, exercise an unseen but all-powerful influence over the sentiment of the whole nation. They decide elections without votes, and sway both parties without being of either. Let men recover from the moral drunkenness of this contest, and come to their sober senses, and the struggle shall be hereafter, who shall be foremost in the Anti-Slavery race. It is to be *the* great question, not only among the Abolitionists, but for the whole people—the "one idea" of the Nation.

Let the few, then, in whose hands rests this great responsibility, be true to their trust. Unmoved by contumely or ridicule, unmoved by appeals to their patriotism, or their anti-slavery, let their range of vision be a broad one, and taking in the whole Anti-Slavery field, past, present, and future, refuse, to participate in an election, which is almost powerless for good or for evil. The past teaches us that we may expect nothing but evil from any administration under the present union with slaveholders: the present bids us hope for the future, only because that future is bright with the promise of better things to come, if the few shall continue as faithful as in the past. We have nothing to gain in the political arena. Let those fight these who will, and who see no higher duty. The true Abolitionist, unseduced by any flattering bribes, undismayed by any threatened loss, unmoved by any apparent triumph, and calm amid reproach and insult, will maintain the higher and nobler position of demanding, *unconditional, immediate*, Emancipation; and turning not aside from this great duty, will ask nothing, seek nothing, and receive nothing less.—G.

HERALD OF FREEDOM.

We regret exceedingly to learn from the Address of the Board of Managers of the New-Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, in the Herald of October the eighteenth, that the young publisher of the paper has pursued a course of conduct towards the Society, in regard to it, which appears to us incapable of justification. The Herald of Freedom is the property and the organ of the New Hampshire Anti-Slavery Society, and no services of an individual member in sustaining it, can make it his, or give him a title to manage it in any way contrary to the wishes and directions of the Society, as expressed by its official servants. It is to be hoped that, instead of letting the case go against him by default,—as the publisher for lack of justification, is obliged to do,—he will relinquish his present indefensible position, and place himself where he stood before these unhappy transactions, by ingenuously acknowledging his error and honorably restoring its property to the officers of the Society. We cannot but believe that he will perceive on more mature reflection that this is the most graceful, as well as the only honorable way of extricating himself from his present unpleasant predicament.

Abolitionists of all men should be scrupulously careful that they do not confound *liberty* with *license*. We hope that the publisher of the Herald will perceive, and never forget that a religious regard for all the rights of others is essential to the enjoyment of true individual freedom.—Q.

ORIGIN OF THE AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

At the New England Convention of 1833, [see Report New England Convention] the following resolution was offered by Mr. GARRISON "Resolved, That the formation of a NATIONAL SOCIETY is essential to the complete regeneration of public sentiment, on the subject of Slavery; and that the Board of Managers of the New England Society be authorized to call a national meeting of the friends of abolition, for the purpose of organizing such a society."

Whereupon the call was issued, and the American Society was organized, and the declaration of sentiments, written by Mr. Garrison, adopted by its founders.

These facts are stated afresh, because a fresh attempt has been made by seceders from that Society, to produce an impression that, from the outset, their principles and sentiments were different from those of Mr. Garrison.

The facts are, that in 1833, they signed their names to his declaration of those principles, and in 1839, having found them unpopular, in a pro-slavery community, and Mr. Garrison still more so, as their representative, they began a series of *open* attempts to rid themselves of the man, and of the principles, for the sake of finding favor with what Mr. Leavitt calls, "the general religious community of this country:" to this hour a pro-slavery one.—c.

THE END OF THE WORLD.

The Millerites are again disappointed. A few of them, however, are still looking for the coming of the Lord, in all this week. Their expectation is founded upon some passage of Scripture in relation to the Feast of Tabernacles—what, I do not precisely know. J. V. Himes, who has been preaching in this city, within a few days past, being convinced that their calculations are at fault, advises all to acknowledge it, and return to their various duties, and be busy in good works. I hope that the advice will be heeded, and that those who have heretofore been active Abolitionists, will "remember those in bonds as bound with them," and return to labor in the good cause. We need their assistance, and their zeal. If the end of the world is not near, the end of Slavery, we hope, is. This is something, which if we can't calculate, we can work for, and it is a work in which, were the Lord to come soon, we may be glad to be found engaged in.

Many of our readers would doubtless be glad to see a greater variety of matter in to-day's paper, but to have delayed the articles of Fulton and Stebbins till next week, would have defeated the purposes of the writers. Communications, Editorials, and General Intelligence, have been crowded out to make room for these electioneering articles, the writers of which are entitled to a hearing. I cry the patience of readers and correspondents, and hope, when the election is over, to cater better for all palates.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The communication of our friend, "G. R." of Virginia, could not be inserted for want of room in this week's paper. I have disposed of it as he requests. Mr. Child will excuse me for deferring his letter till next week. It was received too late for insertion in this paper. "Medical Reformer" is inadmissible. The Standard is devoted to Anti-Slavery, and no articles can be admitted which may lead to protracted discussion on other subjects, or which may interfere with the prejudices or opinions of its readers on other matters. He will see, I hope, that this is our only rational rule.

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign.

EIGHT DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE—ARRIVAL OF THE STEAMSHIP GREAT WESTERN.

The news brought by the Western is unimportant. The cotton market was quiet and steady. Accounts from the manufacturing districts were favorable.

There was a tremendous storm in Ireland on the 8th and 9th instant, in which several lives were lost. Probably the same storm which was felt here on the 6th.

A Treaty has been concluded between France and Morocco.

Letters from Naples state that they expect another eruption of Vesuvius. The crater is full of lava, and the fountains and springs no longer give their usual supply of water.

Louis Philippe in England.—The King of the French and suite embarked at Treport for England on the evening of the 7th instant, and at daybreak the following morning the French fleet approached the English coast, and the inhabitants of Portsmouth, the great naval port of England, were early on the look-out for it, and made every necessary preparation for the reception of the distinguished visitors.

After the arrival of the French fleet and the firing of salutes, &c. the Corporation of Portsmouth, headed by the Mayor, and the Recorder, the latter in his wig and gown, went on board of the Gomer, and there presented the King with a congratulatory address, welcoming him to the shores of England.

IRELAND.

Repeal Association.—This Association held its usual weekly meeting on the 7th inst. The rent amounted to £616. We notice the deaths of the Marquess of Donegal, at Ormeau, near Belfast, and the Lady of Heytesbury, the Lady of the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The late Baroness was second daughter to the Earl of Radnor.

The Liberator has fixed Wednesday, the 20th of November, for a grand banquet in Limerick, on his way from Derrynane to Dublin.

The chairman, and all the Protestant guardians of the North Dublin Union, have vacated their seats at the board, in consequence of the Commissioners insisting on the Roman Catholic schoolmistress being paid the same salary as the Protestant mistress.

HAYTI.

Port Republican papers to September 22d, contain favorable intelligence of the resumption of agricultural labor in the district of Aux Cayes, and in the northern and western sections of the Island, indicating the prospect of perfect tranquillity. A letter from Gonaives testifies to the enthusiastic attachment of the inhabitants of the North to President GUERRIER, "to whom he has been long known for the excellency of his character."

The sentence of ACAU, the *sans-culotte* General, to five years' imprisonment, has been appealed from, and the culprit, greatly to the dissatisfaction of the public, has been granted the privilege of another trial, before a special military council.

General Items.

The Discussion.—We understand that the discussion between Mr. Child and some champion of Liberty, Party (probably Mr. Bradburn,) will take place at Springfield, on Wednesday, (last week.) Our intimation that the liberty folks might back out, probably screwed them up to the sticking point.—*Northampton paper.*

Terrible Gale and Loss of Life at Buffalo.—A most disastrous gale occured at Buffalo on the night of the 18th instant, which has destroyed a large number of human lives, as well as a great amount of property.

NOTICES.

THE ELEVENTH MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

This Annual Bazaar deserves to be considered one of the institutions of the United States; and were we patriots, in the narrow sense of the word, we should beg foreigners to give our country credit accordingly. But it is to the credit of mankind at large, when any human being holds steadily to a holy purpose for eleven consecutive years, through good report and evil report; (the former often the most dangerous to holy purposes;) unwearied by toil, undismayed by opposition, uninfluenced by the flow of time, which wears away so many good intentions. We therefore feel free, seeing that this Bazaar is for the world's credit, and the world's benefit, to call upon all the world for aid as the time draws nigh. Especially to all Abolitionists we would say, in the words of Paul, "I entreat ye, true yoke-fellows, help those women which labored with me in the Gospel, whose names are in the book of life." For eleven years, neither treachery, nor selfish indulgence, nor vanity, nor forgetfulness, nor sinful self-distrust have had power over them to make them hold their names from the book of *this* soul-cheering existence. It is to them no self-denial now, no matter what they may once have counted it, or however the novice in the work may consider it. All other emotions seems unsatisfactory, insufficient, merely personal,

"Compared with these high feelings which inspire
The genius of the gift of Liberty."

What matters it to their hearts, or to the welfare of the slave, that what they do is little, if it be all they can? Is not the cup of cold water, given in the right spirit, still as significant of all that is good, and noble, and successful in life, as it was when the three friends of David hazarded their lives to draw it from the guarded well of Bethlehem, or when the Saviour bestowed his benediction upon all who offer it?

Let all, then, be up and doing. There are but about three months to pass between this time, and the week of the Fair. The prospect at present is, that there will be a smaller, but more attractive exhibition than on any former occasion. A little zeal and diligence will remedy this deficiency in quantity, and make the amount equal to the beauty of the contributions. We heartily thank each and all, "jointly an I severally," of the thirteen Anti-Slavery sewing circles in Worcester county, Massachusetts, who have announced to us their intention of coming to our help. How much their letters only have cheered and helped us, they can never know, till they too shall have labored for a decade, in all the discouragement of loneliness, an I then begin to find that others' hearts are not of stone, but are ready to respond to theirs, if they will but overcome their disinclination to make the appeal.

An appeal like the one we have to make, who that would be thought human, will resist? It is for Freedom!—the basis of all other things;—the magnificent ground-tone in the music of human life, without which, life itself is as naught. Enjoying it ourselves, can we be so base as to find our happiness complete, while a slave calls vainly to us for deliverance!—that were to confess ourselves unworthy of the blessing.

☞ The LIBERTY BELL, our little Anti-Slavery annual, will be published as usual, at the time of the Fair. All of whom we have promise of contributions for it, either literary or pecuniary, or who feel moved to aid it in either way, are requested to write or send *immediately*, to M. W. Chapman, 39 Summer street, Boston; as only an early preparation can ensure a satisfactory completion.

WESTERN NEW-YORK—NOTICE.

WM. W. BROWN will lecture on American Slavery at

Rochester,	November	25.
Macedon Locks,	"	26.
Farmington,	"	27.
Palmyra,	"	28.
Williamson,	"	29.
Sodus Bay Phalanx,	"	30.

These meetings will be held in the evening. The friends in each place are requested to make the proper arrangements, and give early notice in the neighborhood.

RHODE ISLAND.

The ninth Annual Meeting of the *Rhode Island State Anti-Slavery Society*, will be holden at the "New Mechanics Hall," in "Washington Building," Providence, commencing on Wednesday, November 20th, at 3 o'clock, A. M. and will continue in session two or three days.

The well known friends of the cause, from Boston, Massachusetts, from Concord, New Hampshire, and other places, are expected to be present.

The Ladies' Anti-Slavery Society have made arrangements to furnish refreshments for those attending.

It is confidently expected that this will be a meeting of great interest, as a number of interesting and important questions will come up for its consideration. Let the Abolitionists of Rhode Island be there "*en masse.*" To our friends in other States, we say "*come.*"

In behalf of the Board,

A. PAINE, *Secretary.*

ESSEX COUNTY A. S. SOCIETY.

A quarterly meeting of the Essex County Anti-Slavery Society will be holden in Marblehead, commencing on Monday, November 4th, at 1 1-2 o'clock, P. M. to continue the succeeding day and evening.

Subjects of the greatest importance will come up for consideration. It is earnestly hoped that large numbers of the friends from all parts of the country will assemble on that occasion, to urge onward this glorious enterprise.

C. L. Remond, Frederick Douglass, and Henry Clapp, Jr., will be present.

MARY P. KENNY, *Secretary.*

STATE CONVENTION.

The Executive Committee of the Eastern Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, in accordance with a recommendation of the Society, at its meeting in last August, proposes to hold a convention in this city, during the latter part of the month of December, to be composed of all the friends of immediate emancipation, in this and other States who may be disposed to attend. Desirous that it may be a large gathering of the friends of the slave they issue this early notice, hoping that all whose hearts are in the work, will make such arrangements as will enable them to be present. The objects which they propose in holding this convention, which they desire should be decidedly practical in its character and fruitful in its results, are the revival and strengthening of the zeal and faith of Abolitionists, and the gathering of converts to our cause, by faithful exposition of truth, and the thorough discussion of the various topics of practical anti-slavery.

The present aspect of our cause is one of deep interest. Important questions are to be presented to Abolitionists, and will claim our consideration. They have already excited deep thought and earnest discussion, and decided action. Still farther discussion of them, if conducted in a right spirit, cannot be unprofitable to ourselves or to the cause of freedom.

We have no doubt that a convention, such as we propose, will be highly productive of good results, if the friends of the cause will but come thronging to it, with hearts burning with love for the slave, and willing to learn and do all their duty toward him. For his sake do we urge all to come. Let not difficulties, which with a little effort or a little sacrifice may be surmounted, keep any true-hearted Abolitionist away. Let not any say that their presence will be of no importance. Each may impart and receive benefit. Let us gather and have a full, animated, and profitable meeting.

We also cordially invite the attendance of the public generally, being as ever desirous that all, whether friendly or hostile to our enterprise, should hear, and, if they choose, partake in our discussions.

E. M. DAVIS, *Chairman.*

HAWORTH WETHERALD, *Sec'y.*

CONVENTIONS! CONVENTIONS!

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, it was resolved to hold a series of Conventions in Eastern Pennsylvania and such parts of Delaware and New-Jersey, as lie adjacent to Philadelphia; and the undersigned were appointed a committee to carry this resolution into effect.

It is proposed to hold conventions in such of the following places, as on further consultation and correspondence, may be found to be most suitable. Radnor Hall, Montgomery county; Attleboro, Falsington, and Pineville, Bucks county; Phœnixville or Charlestown, West Chester, Coatsville and Kennett Square, Chester county; Marple and Darby, Delaware county; Wilmington, Delaware State; Salem, Woodbury and Crosswicks, New-Jersey.

Persons residing in the several places here mentioned, who may be willing to co-operate in this effort to advance the cause, are requested to write *without delay* to one of the committee of arrangement, mentioning the time that would be most likely to suit them, and the precise place in which they would prefer the meeting to be held.

It is possible that there may be other places not mentioned in the above list, in which meetings might be held to better advantage; persons having information to this effect, are requested to communicate it at once to the committee.

Pains will be taken to secure the attendance at these meetings, of a sufficient number of good speakers to make them interesting. LUCRETIA MOTT,
E. M. DAVIS,
MARY GREW,
J. M. McKIM,
Committee of Arrangements.

WEYMOUTH ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.

It has been found impossible to make preparation for this Fair quite so early as was at first proposed, and notice of the time will be given hereafter. The friends of the cause are entreated to unite with fresh zeal, liberality, and industry, that the occasion may not fail to be what it now promises to be—one of great importance to the Anti-Slavery Enterprise, and of uncommon interest to its advocates. A few very beautiful articles from abroad have been already received, and donations of materials for making more; so that a large attendance on the weekly sewing meeting is more than ever desirable, as the time of the Fair approaches.

MARY WESTON, } Com.
SARAH H. COWING, }

NEW-YORK WHOLESALE PRICES CURRENT.

CORRECTED WEEKLY FOR THE STANDARD.

ASHES.		**IRON.**	
Pot, first sort 1844.	4.18½ a .	Pig, Eng. & Sc. ton	80.00 a 31.00
Pearl	4.25 a 4.31½	do. American	30.00 a 31.00
CANDLES.		Bar do. rolled	80.00 a .
Mould, tallow lb.	9 a 12	do. Russia P,S,I.	90.00 a 100.00
Sperm	39 a 31	do. do. N. Sable	75.00 a .
Stearic do.	20 a 25	do. Swedes	77.50 a .
COAL.		do. Eng. com.	62.50 a 65.00
Liverpool, chaldron,	9.00 a 10.00	do. do. refined	80.00 a .
Newcastle	7.50 a 8.50	Sheet E. & Am. lb.	5½ a 6
Scotch	7.00 a 7.25	Hoop do. do. cwt.	5.00 a 5.50
Sidney and Pictou	7.25 a 7.50	**LEAD.**	
Anthracite, 2,000lbs.	4.50 a 5.50	Pig, 100 lbs.	3.95 a 4.00
COFFEE.		Bar, lb.	4 a 4½
Java	9 a 10½	Sheet	4½ a
Sumatra	6½ a 7	**LEATHER.**	
Porto Rico	7½ a 7¾	Oak lb. (sole,)	19 a 24
Laguayra	7 a 7½	Hemlock, light	14 a 15
Cuba	6 a 7	do. middle	14 a 14½
Brazil	6 a 7	do. heavy	13 a 14
St. Domingo	5½ a 6	do. damaged	11½ a 12½
COTTON.		**LUMBER.**	
New Orleans	4½ a 8½	Boards, N.R.	30.00 a 35.00
Alabama	5 a 8½	M. fl.	
Florida	5 a 8	do. east pine	10.00 a 11.00
Upland	5 a 8	do. Albany, piece	7 a .17
Upland, fair	6½ a 7	Plank Ga. pine, M. ft.	22.00a 30.00
Upland, good and fair	7½ a 8	Scantling pine	14.00 a 16.00
DOMESTICS.		do. oak	30.00 a 35.00
Shirting, brown 3-4	5 a 6¼	Timber oak, cu. ft.	.30 a .37
do. do. 7-8	6 a 7	do.

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE RIGHT.

BY E. H. COGGINS.

Stand for the Right, stand for the Right;
Unfurl the oriflamme wide and high,
To the grassy sward with the gleaming sword,
For Liberty strike, for Liberty die.
Hear ye the sound that is echoing round?
Tyranny comes with his battle-cry,
And numberless spears, to the light he rears,
While pride and hatred scowl in his eye.

On for the Right, on for the Right!
Whips and manacles, tears and death,
Darken the sod where his feet have trod,
Happiness flies from his poison breath.
He flingeth a pall on the hearts of all
Who wield his power or own its sway;
Master and slave in his turbid wave,
Despairing sink from the light of day.

Strike for the Right, Strike for the Right,
The smiles of Angels are cheering us on;
Our hearts are true though our ranks are few,
And bright and keen is the blade we've drawn.
The giant of Wrong, colossal and strong,
Is clad in a vesture of tripple steel;
But his bleeding brow to the earth shall bow,
Before the truth in its infant zeal.

PHILADELPHIA.

BENEATH A PLACID BROW.

BY WILLIAM MOTHERWELL.

Beneath a placid brow,
And tear-unstained cheek,
To bear as I do now
A heart that well could break;
To simulate a smile
Amid the wrecks of grief,—
To herd among the vile,
And therein seek relief,—
For the bitterness of thought
Were joyance dear bought.

When will man learn to bear
His heart nailed on his breast,
With all its lines of care
In nakedness confessed?
Why, in this solemn mask
Of passion-wasted life,
Will no one dare the task,
To speak his sorrows rife?—
Will no one bravely tell,
His bosom is a hell?

I scorn this hated scene
Of masking and disguise,
Where men on men still gleam,
With falseness in their eyes;
Where all is counterfeit,
And truth hath never say;
Where hearts themselves do cheat,
Concealing hope's decay.
And writhing at the stake,
Themselves do liars make.

Go, search thy heart, poor fool!
And mark its passions well;
'T were time to go to school,—
'T were time the truth to tell,—
'T were time this world should cast
Its infant slough away,
And hearts burst forth at last
Into the light of day;—
'T were time all learned to be
Fit for Eternity!

From a London Paper.

TO MY DEPARTED WIFE.

BY A WORKING MAN—JAMES BOYLE, OF MANCHESTER.

Oh, Harriet, dear departed wife!
Though ever prized by me,
I never duly felt till now
How much I've owed to thee.
The busy town, the quiet fields,
Through which we used to stray,
Seem but a dreary wilderness
Since thou wert called away,

But most, when evening's stilly hour
To weary toil brings rest,
I miss the smile and pleasant words
That oft have made me blest;
And Isabel, our darling child,
While nestling on my knee,
Wakes many a thought of faded joy
With prattling tales of thee.

It seems, methinks, but yesterday,
Though twelve long years have gone,
When we before the altar knelt,
And join'd our hearts in one;—
When, caring not for griefs to come,
While all around us smiled,
We revelled 'midst the joys of Spring,
Gay as our youngest child.

The laughing spring, with flowery wreaths,
Will come again ere long,
And many a grove and bloomy copse
Be rife with joyous song;
But Spring may spread her treasures rare
On coppice, hill, and tree,
Since thou canst feel her charms no more,
They'll bloom in vain for me.

Oh, I am very lonely now!
For though our friends are kind,
And use each little art to soothe
My dark and troubled mind,
Yet still, at best, they are but friends,
And, kind although they be,
I can't unlock my heart to them,
As once I could to thee.

Oh, when I gaze, as oft I do,
Upon our children dear,
My lonely heart is swelling then
With mingled grief and fear;
I think, as through life's scenes they go,
Beset with many a snare,
How much they'll need such love as thine—
Such kind and watchful care.

But, Harriet, for those dear ones' sake,
So much beloved by thee,
I'll try to stifle vain regrets,
Though hard the task may be;
I'll teach them, love, in virtue's light
To tread life's varied scene;—
To take the path that thou hast trod—
To be what thou hast been.

SONNET.

There is no remedy for time misspent,
No healing for the waste of illeness,
Whose very langnor is a punishment—
Heavier than active souls can feel or guess,
Oh! hours of indolence and discontent,
Not now to be redeemed! ye sting not less,
Because I know this span of life was lent—
For lofty duties, not for selfishness.
Not to be whiled away in aimless dreams,
But to improve ourselves and serve mankind,
Life and its choicest faculties were given.
Man should be ever better than he seems—
And shape his acts, and discipline his mind
To walk adorning earth, deserving heaven.

Miscellany.

From the National Intelligencer.

LETTER FROM J. C. PICKETT, ESQ.

United States Chargé d'Affaires at Lima, on the subject of some remarkable ruins in the province of Chachapoyas. Read before the April meeting of the Institute.

LIMA, October 10, 1843.

DEAR SIR: I now enclose to you the original and translation of a letter lately published, from Judge Nieto, to the Prefect of the Department of the Amazon, in which he describes some very extensive and interesting ruins in the province of Chachapoyas. This province is about five hundred and fifty miles to the north of Lima, and about two hundred and fifty from the coast, and is looked upon here as being rather remote; is not very populous, and not much known to the inhabitants of this metropolis.

The official station of Judge Nieto, who appears to be an intelligent man, and of some reading, (learned it may be,) is a sufficient guaranty, I suppose, that he has intended to describe what he has seen, faithfully and accurately; yet his description, and particularly the beginning of it, appears to me to be rather confused and unsatisfactory; and I cannot but believe that he has exaggerated considerably the height of the edifices he visited, which it was rather natural to do, unless he had actually measured them; and this he does not seem to have done. I think, too, that he has used the word *circumference* for *contents*. But, supposing this to be the case, still there can be no doubt that the ruins are gigantic and curious, of unknown origin, and of unknown destination, unless they were intended for cemeteries or fortresses, as the Judge conjectures, but which does not seem to be as yet very clearly proven, though that they were intended for one or the other I think probable. But, being on a scale of great magnificence and extent, it is rather difficult to believe that that country could ever have been so populous as to require such extraordinary structures for the reception of the dead. Yet it may have been, for evidence enough is found in many parts of America to prove that regions now desert and desolate, once teemed with a dense, a busy, and perhaps a happy population; and this may have been the case in Chachapoyas, some centuries ago.

Judge Nieto, not satisfied with describing what he had seen, indulges in system-making, and at the close of his letter announces his theory, which is, that America is the "old world with respect to the other parts of it," and that Babylon, Balbec, &c. were modern compared to the people that once inhabited Chachapoyas. In support of this theory he embodies a variety of facts, as he considers them, more or less plausible—some unquestionable, some not very well established, some not of much force, and others, apparently, rather in his favor. I admire the boldness of the Judge and commend his enthusiasm, but am not able to adopt his conclusions, though I would willingly do so, for I too indulge a little of that continental pride, if it can be so called, which leads me to wish to see it proven that America is really the "old world," and the land that first enjoyed the blessings of civilization. I much fear though that this cannot be established, and that an impartial examination of the subject must lead to admissions not very favorable to a high antiquity. I propose to consider Judge Nieto's arguments somewhat at length, but not in the spirit of controversy, for my feelings are with him, though my judgment compels me to dissent from the views he has taken of this very interesting subject.

The hair on the heads of the infant skeletons was short, fine, and brown, the Judge says, and unlike that of the Indians of the present day. This proves but little. Time and circumstances may have changed the original color of the hair. The Spanish word for the color is *rubio*, which is not very definite, for it used to describe either dark brown, or light brown, and the intermediate hues, but means generally what we call *auburn*. Short and fine it was of course, as the hair of an Indian infant is. Should hair of this description be found on the skulls of the skeletons of adults so uniformly as to show that that kind of hair belonged to the *race*, then the argument would have weight; but if found only in a few instances, it would be entitled to none, for the Albinos have white hair or wool, and Catlin found in the "Far West" a young Indian woman whose hair was naturally, or rather preternaturally, white.

The Judge assumes that the ancient articles of gold and silver of elegant workmanship, which are discovered from time to time, as well as the hard precious stones, could not have been executed without instruments of iron and steel, which were absolutely unknown to the Indian aborigines of Peru, as I believe, and as is generally believed. It is true that ancient articles of gold and silver, and of curious and elaborate workmanship, are sometimes found, and also that hard stones, emeralds, turquoises, and rock crystal, (there were no others,) were cut and fashioned in various ways. The question is, could the articles have been produced without the use of iron and steel? The Judge maintains that they could not be; I entertain a different opinion.

I do not pretend to cite as conclusive the authority of the Spanish authors who wrote about Peruvian affairs soon after the conquest. Although they all, I believe, favor the opinion that the articles in question were the work of the race of people found in Peru by the Spaniards, they say that iron and steel were unknown, and express their wonder how such curious things could be made without them. But these writers, though indifferently honest, and in many respects authentic, were credulous, not very acute, with a propensity, without knowing it, to exaggerate, and withal bigoted and superstitious, and would not have dared to start any theories that, like Judge Nieto's, might have made the new world just discovered more ancient than the *old*, for they had the fear of the Inquisition before their eyes.

It is known that the natives of this continent, before the arrival of the Spaniards, in place of iron and steel, used obsidian, flint, copper, and a mixture of copper and tin, and with these, and much perseverance and ingenuity in the use of them, it appears to me that nothing that is antique has yet been discovered that may not have been produced without the agency of iron, from such vast edifices as exist in Central America, Yucatan, and Chachapoyas, down to the gold and silver tweezers sometimes found, not weighing more than a ten cent piece. If I mistake not, all the stone that has been used for building, for architectural ornaments of all kinds, for sculpture and inscriptions, will be found to be either lime or sandstone, or some other soft stone that would be as easily worked with tools of flint, obsidian, or copper, as the Egyptian granite could be with steel, and indeed much easier. In working gold and silver there would be no difficulty, and the hard stones, emeralds, &c. by allowing time, patience, and some ingenuity, present none that is insuperable. We know that some arts, more curious than useful, have been lost in Europe and Asia, and it does not appear to me to be a very violent supposition that the ancient Peruvians might have possessed a method of cutting and polishing precious stones not now known, and perhaps never to be.

The solution of this difficulty, which I now offer, is greatly strengthened I think by an argument which does not appear to have been sufficiently considered by those who maintain that the ancient works could not have been executed without the use of iron and steel—which is, the little value of the time of the ancient indigenæ. This I deduce from well-established facts as a strictly logical inference. I speak only of Peru, but what I say will apply perhaps to any country in America where antiquities are to be met with. The Government of the Incas, though in many respects paternal and just, was nevertheless most sternly despotic. The Inca, the monarch, was not only the *pater patriæ*, but was also the absolute owner of the soil and of everything on it—of all the men, all the women, and all the chattels; and this not in the feudal sense, as lord paramount, but as a planter owns the slaves belonging to his plantation, and indeed his ownership was still more absolute. Whether this unlimited power was abused or not, depended entirely on the personal character of the sovereign. Humboldt, speaking of the Inca Government, says that it produced "general comfort and but little private happiness; there was more submission to the will of the sovereign than love of country; passive obedience, without courage for bold undertakings; and the founder of the empire of Cuzco (Manco Capac) in flattering himself that he could force men to be happy, reduced them to the condition of simple machines." This is rather a sombre picture.

In a country with such a Government, which was generally as mild and indulgent, however, as the institutions permitted the sovereigns to be, and with a crowded population, I suppose that labor must have been very abundant and very cheap, and that a mechanic could afford to dedicate months or even years to a piece of work that would now be executed in a day or two. It is further to be considered that, according to the institutions, all luxury was almost entirely banished by sumptuary laws rigidly enforced, and the utmost simplicity was practised in everything—particularly in food and clothing. With such a polity, in a mild climate, without winter, (as known to us,) and with a fertile soil, with no literature, and with little or nothing to minister intellectual occupation, time could have been of but little value to those who disposed of it as a marketable commodity, and to others, of less. In China, servants can be had for fifty cents per month. Were it possible to institute a comparison, I think it would appear that wages were still much lower in ancient Peru.

If I am not wrong in my reasoning, there is no necessity for assuming the existence of a race distinct from or superior to that which occupied this country at the time of its conquest by the Spaniards. I suppose that if the Inca chose to do so, he could have kept one-sixth or seventh of the whole population of Peru constantly employed; and that vast numbers were employed, the edifices, roads, and very extensive works for irrigating the soil, found by the Spaniards, were visible, and unquestionable proofs. In an ancient wall at Cuzco, there are rocks, which, judging from their dimensions, do not weigh less, probably, than two hundred tons. And some of these rocks, Garcilaso de la Vega says, were brought three or four leagues, and conveyed across a river. How would it be possible for a people, ignorant of almost all mechanical contrivances, to perform such a labor but by the application of physical force, instead of mechanical skill? And that force was without doubt applied. Garcilaso relates that on one occasion, one of these huge rocks broke loose from its fastenings, and crushed four thousand persons, and though I think the number exaggerated, still the fact goes to prove that vast numbers of persons were employed in those great works which now astonish the beholder and tempt him to exclaim, "There were giants in those days!" No. There were no giants, but an infinity of human machines, directed by one iron will; and wherever these structures are found, I consider them to be proofs pregnant and decisive of two things: that at the time they were erected there existed a dense population and a severe and despotic Government. We are in the habit of regarding the pyramids of Egypt as monuments of a great and enlightened people, when they are, in truth, I suppose, nothing more than monuments of the despotism and cruelty of the Egyptian kings. We are astonished at the gigantic and imposing magnitude of these structures—think of the forty centuries that have passed over them, and give but little thought to the oppressed and miserable multitudes that erected them. The Thames tunnel, subterranean and subfluvial as it is, is a much nobler monument, in my opinion, than all the pyramids and all the obelisks of Egypt together.

Judge Nieto argues that the inhabitants of Chachapoyas could have had no motive for erecting the *fortress*, as he calls it at the close of his letter, on account of their pacific character; and that from Tupac Yupanqui, the conqueror of the country, until the coming of the Spaniards, there was no time to build it, and that there were no materials. This, I must say, is taking but a very partial view of the matter. There is no historical authority, I believe, that goes to show certainly, that the fortress, if one, was built in the time of the Incas, or that it was not. It might have been erected by them, or it might have been before they conquered Chachapoyas; for Garcilaso expressly says, that when Yupanqui invaded the country, the inhabitants defended themselves courageously, and that they had many fortresses occupying strong positions which he found it difficult to reduce. They at length submitted, being overpowered. They rebelled against Huyana Capac, as the Judge states, but being abandoned by their allies, they thought it more prudent to implore the sovereign's clemency than to engage in a hopeless contest; for, left as they were, alone, the conflict would have been about as unequal as if the State of Delaware should make war upon all the rest of the Union. The *Chachas*, as they were called, might have been turbulent and rebellious subjects; but I do not think there exists any reason for supposing that they were such blustering braggarts as the Judge represents them to be. Garcilaso, from whom he takes the story of the intercession of the *matron* (who had been a *chere amie* of Yupanqui) in their behalf, does not give them this character. On the contrary, he says they were brave and warlike.

According to an old Spanish author, the word Chachapoyas, or, more correctly, *Chachapuyu*, signifies the *place of strong men*. Whether this name bears any relation to the character of the people or not, is uncertain; but there can be no doubt that the Chachas were a superior race to the nations or tribes in their vicinity, and, as they understood and practised the art of constructing fortified places not easily taken, it is not illogical to suppose that they were in some degree civilized before their incorporation with the Peruvian empire; that they had a knowledge of the mechanical arts as then practised, and that they were the architects of the edifice described by Judge Nieto; and there seems to be no necessity whatever for supposing it to be a monument of a "great and enlightened nation that occupied the territory," and that had "declined as Babylon, Balbec, and the Syrian cities had done." My opinion is, that that great and enlightened nation, supposed to be acquainted with iron and steel, was no other than the Chachas, who had not deteriorated when discovered by the Spaniards, but had made some further advances in civilization, perhaps after building the fortress, cemetery or temple, or whatever it may be, in consequence of their union with the Peruvians.

There is another argument (whether overlooked heretofore or not I do not know) which militates strongly against the idea of the existence of that great and enlightened nation, familiar with the use of iron and steel, to whose agency is ascribed the remarkable and magnificent ruins that are found on this continent, and to which it is at once both natural and pleasing to assign a very remote antiquity. This is, that the manufacture of iron is an art at once so useful and simple, that, if once known, it is scarcely possible it could be lost. The people possessing it might decline, relapse, it may be, into barbarism—lose many arts, but one so indispensable (now considered to be) both to the savage and civilized man, could not be lost, by any other means than by the sudden and total annihilation of the race. That any such catastrophe has taken place there is no reason to believe, and it appears to me that the art of manufacturing iron, if once known and extensively practised, as it must have been if practised at all by the ancient inhabitants of South America, would have been almost in as little danger of being lost as the art of cooking food. To this I add, that I believe it certain that not the slightest trace of iron instruments has been discovered at any time, by any person, among the ancient ruins—not an atom of the metal, nor even a particle of rust, to indicate its existence; which, superadded to the fact that all the authors, ancient and modern, say that iron was unknown to the natives at the arrival of the Spaniards, is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that it had never been known in the country. Kaempfer supposes that the Japanese possess the art of hardening copper so as to make it supply the place of iron. I doubt this; but if such an art exists now, or ever did exist, and was known to the ancient inhabitants of this continent, many difficulties would be removed. I cannot believe, though, that it was known to them. Had it been, I cannot suppose that it would have been lost.

All this being considered, it appears to me that there is nothing to support Judge Nieto in the opinion that the edifice he describes was erected by a very ancient people acquainted with iron and steel. Should any extensive ruins be discovered of hewn granite, or any other very hard stone, then I will confess myself puzzled; but I do not suppose that any such will be discovered, and, until they are, I must believe that the opinion expressed by Mr. Stephens in his valuable and interesting works, in which he describes the ruins of Palenque and of Yucatan, is the correct one—that "they (the ruined cities) are not the works of a people who have passed away, and whose history is lost, but of the same races who inhabited the country at the time of the Spanish conquest, or of some not very distant progenitors;" and the facts and arguments adduced by him in support of this opinion seem to me to be conclusive. The present degraded and wretched condition of the Indians proves nothing but that the Spaniards carried out most effectually their atrocious policy, which was to make of them hewers of wood and drawers of water with the least possible delay—to convert them from independent rational beings, into stupid, passive machines; and the object was accomplished with surprising celerity. Within one century after the Spaniards conquered the country, the condition of the aborigines was more deplorable, if possible, than at the present day. It would seem that such an astonishing metamorphosis, would be impossible, supposing them to be the descendants, not very far removed, of those who built the ruined cities. But it might well be so, for never were conquerors more successful in obliterating the national and individual character of the conquered than the Spaniards. They did not want to make of their vassals either citizens or subjects, but slaves, and they made them so by a very compendious process—by condemning them to incessant labor, and by proscribing all the laws, customs, usages, and religious rites that were calculated to foster in the slightest degree the sentiment of nationality.

The South American Indians are not the only people who have undergone such an extraordinary transformation. The Copts of the present day are the descendants of the ancient Egyptians, and the Egyptian Arabs of those who conquered the country in the name of Mahomet. But the most striking example is that of the modern Greeks. Who could have supposed, but for the irrefragable attestations of history, that, after submitting to the brutal and fanatical Turk, they were descended from those who fought at Salamis and Marathon? It is true, they had begun to degenerate before conquered by the Turks, but that conquest alone accounts for their rapid declension.

The absence of tradition among the Indians in relation to their former *status*, is very satisfactorily accounted for by Mr. Stephens. In that respect they do not differ from other communities in the same situation. There is but little tradition among any of the indigenous races that have been *reduced* (*reducido*, an expressive word) by the Spaniards, though some of them have had abundant materials for very glorious and inspiring traditions. Such are the Mexicans, the Yucatanejos, the Palenquenos, the Peruvians, and the Bogotanos. A state of abject slavery is decidedly unfavorable to the transmission of traditionary lore; and no nation, I think, has ever been very traditional in its character, unless it has enjoyed a considerable degree of freedom—individual, if not political—nor unless it has been somewhat intellectual and imaginative, (with or without literature;) nor unless it has claims (founded or unfounded) to glorious achievements in war. In their most palmy days the Indians in question may not have abounded much in tradition, or, if they did abound in it, that they should have forgotten it in three hundred years, enslaved, oppressed, and crushed as they have been, is certainly not astonishing. It would rather be if they had not. The Araucanians immortalized by Ercilla in his poem, have traditions, and well they may have, for they resisted, and successfully, all attempts by the Spaniards to subjugate them for more than two hundred years, and were not content to act on the defensive merely, but were often the assailants, and with signal success sometimes. But, should this indomitable race be reduced to slavery, and continue enslaved for three centuries, it is highly probable that at the end of that period their traditions, as well as every trace of the bold and independent character for which they are distinguished, would be utterly and irretrievably lost.

Hence I conclude that certain favorable circumstances are essential to the existence of much tradition among a people, and that under very adverse circumstances they may soon be forgotten in a country where there are no collateral records, and where the art of writing was unknown, or very imperfectly practised, as among the Indians of this continent; for the picture-writing of Mexico must have been very defective, and from its nature, difficult of attainment. Judging from the inscriptions discovered in Central America and Yucatan, it may be supposed that those who made them possessed something like the art of writing; but it must have been, I think, very imperfect. But this would be only conjectural, and the art, if known, may have been a very difficult one, and known to but few, probably, as the schoolmaster was not abroad in those days.

The *quipos* or *quipus* in Peru were still more defective than the others, it may be presumed. These, as is well known, were nothing more than *knots*, as is the meaning of the word, tied with cotton threads of different colors; and the whole process was strictly conventional, there being no way of expressing an idea that had not its predetermined sign. The *quipus* were used for keeping all the public accounts, births, deaths, receipts at the treasury, (not in money but in kind,) &c.; and the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury must have been a very curious document, and sometimes, perhaps, a skein rather difficult to unravel. But it must be said for the Peruvians, in the time of the Incas, that their probity has not probably been exceeded by that of any other people, ancient or modern. Among their public men, fraud, speculation, embezzlement, and bribery seem to have been unknown; and this is in part to be accounted for from the nature of the institutions, and partly from the fact that there was no money, that root and origin of all evil.

The *Quipucamayus* (keepers of the knots) were the scribes and historiographers, and also the auditors and comptrollers. They attained to great dexterity in their art, and could record and recite with surprising rapidity, and adjust accounts with undeviating accuracy; but they could not go far beyond this. Some events of a very important nature could be recorded, such as embassies, battles, &c. because the colors, numbers of knots, &c. to be used had been previously determined; but it was impossible to write a letter, however brief it might be, unless the *quipus* and the key had been concerted as in the use of the *cipher*. The Inca, therefore, when he wished to send an order to any part of his dominions, employed messengers, to whom it was given verbally. These were called *chasquis*, and were stationed constantly on the highways, one-fourth of a league apart; and as they were swift of foot, and the messages being very brief, generally, they were conveyed with considerable rapidity, faster than by a mail-coach; but it is probable that serious blunders were sometimes committed, for, in transmitting an order one hundred miles, it had to be repeated by about one hundred and thirty persons.

[*To be concluded.*]

From the New-York Evening Post.

WHO WAS BLANNERHASSET?

SIR:—I read in a number of the Evening Post, I think that of the 9th of last month, a paragraph copied from a southern paper, to which were prefixed some editorial observations, which appeared to attach a character of correctness to the appended remarks.

The article to which I refer had prefixed to it the interrogatory which I have attached to this communication.

I will now answer this inquiry. In so doing I will give one instance of the ignorance of the writer of that silly effusion, by stating that the name is not Blannerhasset, but Blennerhasset.

Harman Blennerhasset and his eldest brother William, were the immediate descendants of Luther Blennerhassett of Baleyseed, in the County of King, Ireland, a gentleman who inherited a large estate, and frequently represented his native county in Parliament; few men were more generally or deservedly respected, and uniting in his person a suavity and courtesy of demeanor to a firmness and decision of character, calculated as well to command respect as to conciliate esteem, acquire the soubriquet of "Arthur Hero," and "Hero Hassett," under which designation he is more frequently spoken of and referred to, than by any other name.

William inherited the family estates, which were and are considerable. Harman had a younger child's portion, which amounted either to 5 or £10,000 sterling, and early indicated a bold, aspiring, and ardent disposition, while his elder brother, who was appointed Collector of Customs, of the port of Traen, manifested quite a different character. Nearly connected with the family was General Agnew, who, during the war of Independence, held, if I mistake not, a high military situation in the Royal Army in this country. At his death General A. left an only child, a daughter, to the care and guardianship of his relation, Harman Blennerhasset. Miss Agnew was a very fine girl, and possessed a very handsome fortune. Her education and acquirements were of the highest character, and few young women were more universally or deservedly admired and esteemed. A warm attachment arose between the guardian and ward, and as they seemed to think that obstacles of a serious character might exist in Ireland to their union, they rendered their property available, amounting at least to £20,000 sterling, and, after a private union, proceeded to America, a country towards which Mr. B. entertained feelings of the most favorable character, his mind having been strongly tinctured with those principles of liberty which has so general an influence throughout a great portion of Europe. In 1796 he arrived in this country, and publicly espoused his ward and relative.

An island in the Ohio particularly struck his active and ardent mind, and though that region of country was then a wilderness, he resolved on settling there. How far he succeeded in cultivating and beautifying that island, is generally known, and even now Blennerhasset's Island is a subject of inquiry to all travellers on the river Ohio. In a letter written some years subsequent to his settlement, after describing his locality, &c. which he knew would be interesting to an absent friend, he remarked, that although he always contemplated perfect happiness in this world as beyond the reach of finite mortality, he had now to admit that he had acquired a terrestrial paradise. How that paradise was entered, and its gates afterwards closed upon him, are matters on record in the history of this country.

In Ireland, Mr. B. was the relative, friend, and fellow-student of an individual whose name must be co-eternal in the histories of Ireland and America, the late Thomas Addis Emmet. On Mr. E.'s arrival in this country, one of the first inquiries was after his old friend; they soon met, early associations were recalled, and former friendship re-established. On many subsequent occasions, Mr. B. and his estimable companion were the guests of Mr. E. in this city. When Mr. B. got in trouble, an ample field was afforded to Mr. E. to manifest those feelings of which his whole life formed but one continued manifestation; unable to aid him professionally in his defence, which a sense of duty to his numerous clients alone prevented, his house and his purse were open to him, and many thousands of dollars given to him, when numbers of those who, in his prosperity, fawned upon and courted him, but, as is unfortunately too much the case, in his adversity forsook him.

Such, Sir, was Harman Blennerhasset; he and his wife are both in the silent grave; one died in this country, the other in Europe; requiescat in pace.

As regards the individual who has been attempted to be substituted for Mr. B. (Lewis Carr,) I have no knowledge. There, however, was such an individual; and there is now in this city, a gentleman of high and exalted character, a personal friend to the late Mr. B. and who was also acquainted with Carr and his wife; from him I have heard that Carr is dead, and that within a year past, his wife, or as you knew her, the woman he lived with, was alive, and a resident of this city or its vicinity.

Mr. Blennerhasset left a family, of whom I know nothing. One of them is, I believe, in this city, possessed of very limited means, and endeavoring, by humble and honest industry, to obtain a support: he is, if I am correctly informed, a portrait and landscape painter.

I did mean to enter into several particulars connected with the Blennerhasset family, (which takes a high rank among the oldest and most influential families in Ireland,) which would be interesting, even to the general reader, who may be unacquainted with the name, but I have already extended my remarks too far, and, in extenuation, subscribe myself, characteristically, as

AN IRISHMAN.

THE TIMES OF THOMAS A BECKET.

"1170. When the catastrophe of Archbishop Becket had occurred at Canterbury, he was considered to have fallen a martyr to his fidelity to the Church, and a bull was issued by Pope Alexander III. declaring the canonization of the Archbishop, directed to the clergy and all Christian people. Miracles were said to have been wrought at his tomb, and this being reported at home and abroad, brought multitudes to Canterbury. About fifty years after the death of Becket, his remains were removed from the undercroft to his shrine at the east end of the Cathedral, upon which occasion great ceremony was observed; and the resort of the pious was so multitudinous that the expenses incurred for hay and corn between London and Canterbury, for the horses of all that might attend the solemnity, and for wine running in conduits in several parts of the latter city for their refection, were so great, that Stephen, then Archbishop, who made this provision, incurred a debt that burdened the next four successors to the See. Certain stations on the great highway bear the name of St. Thomas's waterings, where the devotees halted on the journey; and at Gravesend, some houses situated in the line, have been called St. Thomas's houses, as it is supposed from these circumstances.

"A contemporary writer, William Fitzstephen, a monk of Canterbury, and Secretary to Archbishop Becket, has left, in a description of London, an account of arrangements upon the 'river's bank,' for the accommodation of strangers arriving or departing between the Vintry and Billingsgate, the place of resort of the old Gravesend barge, from the remotest times, and of which great numbers passing between London and the shrine of his *quondam* patron and upon various other occasions, would avail themselves.

"'There is in London,' Fitzstephen says, 'upon the river's bank, a public place of cookery, among the wines to be sold in the ships and wine cellars. There every day we may call for any dish of meat, roast, fried, or broiled; fish, both small and great; ordinary flesh for the poorer sort, and more dainty for the rich, as venison and fowl. If friends came upon a sudden, wearied with travel, to a citizen's house, and they loath to wait for curious preparation and dressings of fresh meat, let the servants give them water to wash, and bread to stay the stomach; and in the meantime *they run to the water side*, where all things that can be desired, are at hand. *Whatsoever multitude of soldiers, or other strangers enter into the city, at any hour of the night, or else are about to depart, they may turn in, but here, and refresh themselves to their content, and avoid long fasting, and not go away without their meal.*' This description does as exactly portray the resort of strangers to the modern Gravesend barge or tiltboat at Billingsgate, as it does the river's bank in the days of Fitzstephen. The strangers represented as entering into the city at any hour of the night, or else being about to depart, turning in to bait—to avoid long fasting—and not to go away without their meal, must refer to passengers by the Gravesend barge. Surely, the writer himself had enjoyed the ready entertainment and good cheer by day or by night that he so vividly describes, and which suited the varying departure or arrival of the barge, that depended upon the fluctuations of the tides, and in which, peradventure, the Secretary often had occasion to pass in his journeyings between London and Canterbury."

SCOTT'S MISAPPLICATION OF HIS TALENTS.

In a railroad carriage the other day, the conversation between two of the passengers turned on the genius of Sir Walter Scott. "All very well," observed a third, in a pooh-poohing tone; "but I consider him to be very much over-rated." "Over-rated!" "Mind," continued the objector, "I don't mean to deny that he had talent—*great* talent; *but it is a pity he did not apply it to a better purpose.*" "A better purpose! *What?*" "Why," replied the utilitarian, "with such talents as his, what might he not have been if he had *stuck to his profession.*"

And Shakspeare! what improvements in the art of wood-combing might not have been discovered, had the same "talent" which produced *Othello* and *As You Like It*, been "applied to better purpose"—had *Shakspeare* stuck to his profession! "How staid a scrivener was in Milton lost!" Pope, too. When he sung, "I left no calling for this idle trade," he forgot that for the measures of verse he forsook the measures in the linen-drapery shop of his father. Had he not so misapplied his "talent" we should have been without the *Rape of the Lock*, the *Elosia*, the Satires—but, then, the world had had a linen-draper, such as the world had never looked upon before. And Scott's contemporaries, Southey, Rogers, Campbell, Hallam, Moore, and others—all, all to be pitied—whence is such a mass of pity to be supplied!—for not applying their talent to better purposes!

There is much in this little anecdote. It furnishes an unhappy sign of the times. The speaker is not singular in his notion of the proper application of "talent." Unhappily, he is one of a very numerous NOB, whose object is to sacrifice all that elevates, ennobles, and refines, to mere money-getting utility. He did not formally renounce his politics, nor was there any need he should. He said sufficient to prove himself to be nothing more than a coarse, gross Cobdenite.—*London paper.*

MODESTY AND PIETY.—The following advertisement appears in a Manchester paper: "To Drapers, Haberdashers, Warehousemen, &c.—Wanted, by an eminently pious young man, of Scotland, who has been regularly bred to the above branches, a situation as assistant clerk, manager, salesman, or traveller. The advertiser is 24 years of age, possessed of excellent health, amiable disposition, good ability, extensive knowledge of the great Scriptural doctrines, strictly evangelical, and would be found of immense advantage in assisting to advance the claims and reign of Messiah's kingdom, amidst the civil and ecclesiastical opposition so prevalent amongst the nations of the earth in these latter agitating times. Testimonials and references to several eminent evangelical dissenting ministers and members of the Gospel, as well as to his present employers, of the most satisfactory tendency as to character and ability, *with portrait*, may be had on application. A house favorable to evangelical, Presbyterian, or independent church principles, affording permanent employment, and progressive advancement of salary, preferred."

Negroiana.—A planter in Virginia once owned a slave in connection with one of his neighbors. He was a pious man, and would sometimes wind off his prayers by saying—'Oh Lord! in addition to all the blessings, I, a sinner, have asked at your hands, *will you*, in your infinite mercy and goodness, condescend to *bless my half of Pomp!*"

Books,

For Sale at the Office of the American A. S. Society, 142 Nassau St. N. Y.

THE LIBERTY BELL of 1844, an Annual, published for the Massachusetts Fair, and consisting of various original articles, from the ablest Anti-Slavery writers in this country, Great Britain and Ireland.

XIMENA, AND OTHER POEMS, by *James Bayard Taylor*. Philadelphia, 1844.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THIEVES, or a true picture of the AMERICAN CHURCH AND CLERGY, by *S. S. Foster*; and various other standard Anti-Slavery works.

New-York, July 4, 1844.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

(Second Edition.)

JUST Published, and for sale at this office, a new work on Capital Punishment. By Charles Spear. It contains a variety of thrilling and instructive anecdotes; also, all the capital offenses in every State in the Union; and a speech from O'Connell on the subject. Also, several instances of the execution of the *innocent*. Facts are drawn from history and observation, and the entire scripture ground has been examined. The work is embellished with a fine engraving. Price, 62 1-2 cents.

TEXAN REVOLUTION.

Republished (with additions) at Washington, D. C., from the Northampton (Mass.) Gazette.

To which is added,—

A LETTER FROM WASHINGTON, ON THE ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, AND THE LATE OUTRAGE IN CALIFORNIA—REPUBLISHED, WITH ADDITIONS FROM THE LIBERATOR. By Probus.

This is a pamphlet of about 100 large octavo pages. Only a small part consists of the republications; the additions being ten or twelve times larger than the originals. The subjects discussed, are:—

I. The history and merits of the Texan Revolution, under the following heads:

1. The perfidy of the President, and the lawless proceedings of citizens of the United States, who went to Texas "to sow a rebellion."

2. Kindness, hospitality, and generosity of the Mexicans; ingratitude and treachery of the revolutionists.

3. Pretexts of the Revolution. Under this head is a very full account of the political changes which have taken place in Mexico, and of their causes;—the working of the Federative or Federal form of Government, as compared with the Consolidated or Central, in the South American States; a comparative history of *Nullification* in Mexico and the United States; the difference between the South American Federal and Central systems substantially that between our present form of government, and the form proposed by ALEXANDER HAMILTON; the political history of the South American States, and the history and prospects of nullification in the United States, some test of the comparative value of the two systems.

4. Real Causes of the Texan Revolution.

II. The subject of the second Part, or Letter, is the design of annexing Texas to this Union, *at the first session of the next Congress*. The subdivisions of this subject are:—

1. Review of a letter (said to have been, originally, private,) of ex-Governor Gilmer, of Virginia, on the necessity of the speedy annexation of Texas.

2. The principles, speeches, reports, official correspondence, and operations of the leading and confidential friends of John Tyler, in the Cabinet, and in Congress; the alliance between them and the leading members of the democratic party for the extension and perpetuation of slavery and the slave trade, by the acquisition of Texas and California; the outrage committed by Commodore Jones in the latter province, a part, and in execution, of the secret schemes of the cabinet, and a natural result of their spirit and purposes; the ostensible reasons for that outrage examined.

3. The determination and tendency of their policy to bring about a war between the United States of the one part, and Mexico and Great Britain of the other; it being perfectly understood that the former cannot be despoiled of territory fifteen times as large as the State of New-York, and eighty times as large as Massachusetts, without war with Great Britain, as well as with her.

4. The Oregon Bill, a part of the said schemes.

5. The questions of *Visitation* and *Search*, on the coast of Africa, for the arrest of slave trading pirates; the actual extent of the slave trade, and its exclusive prosecution under the American flag; the Quintuple and Ashburton Treaties, Gen. Cass's pamphlet and correspondence in France.

6. Negotiations of our government with Mexico for the cession of Texas and California, from the accession of Gen. Jackson to the present time; Character and proceedings of Messrs. Poinsett and Butler, ministers of the United States, in Mexico; suppression, and probable destruction of official documents; *corruption* brought to light; correspondence of Messrs. Webster and Thompson, with Messrs. de Bocanegra and Almonte; *mistranslations*, in our Department of State, and in our Legation at Mexico, of Mexican official documents.

APPENDIX.

1. John Quincy Adams's opinion of the conduct of our government towards Mexico, extracted from his address to his constituents, September 12, 1842.

2. Collection of Proclamations of neutrality, issued by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Van Buren, and Tyler.

☞ For Sale at this Office.

FREE CALICOES!

JUST received, 1 case fine calicoes. Also, 2 cases fine shirting muslins; together with a large assortment of other free dry goods, at reduced prices, wholesale and retail. CHARLES WISE,

Northwest corner Arch and Fifth streets

Philadelphia, 8th, mo. 17th 1843. tf.

Education and Industry!

THE Northampton Association of Education and Industry have appropriated a suitable tenement for the accommodation of fifteen or twenty boarding pupils. There will be members of a family, under the care of the Director of Education, assisted by his wife, and other teachers, and will be subject to the same treatment and regulations as pupils who are members of the association.—The name of the association indicates the idea of culture, towards the realization of which our efforts will be directed. Systematic, habitual industry is deemed indispensable to education, which should aim at the harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious tendencies in active, practical life.

We shall consider $100 a year as an equivalent for instruction and board; from which a suitable deduction will be made when a pupil com